ENALLAGE
AND GREEK STYLE

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

W. DEN BOER • W. J. VERDENIUS • R. E. H. WESTENDORP BOERMA

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM VICESIMUM NONUM

VICTOR BERS

ENALLAGE AND GREEK STYLE

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXIV

ENALLAGE AND GREEK STYLE

BY

VICTOR BERS

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXIV

ISBN 90 04 03786 1

Copyright 1974 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TO MY PARENTS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ix
Abbreviated References. xi

I. Enallage: Is There Such a Thing? 1
II. The Origin of Enallage 21
III. Evidence for Enallage as Archaism 28
IV. Enallage in Pindar and the Tragedians 43

Appendixes:
A. "Enallage", "Hypallage", and "Transferred Epithet". 70
B. πόντος and ἁλός. 71
C. τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου 71
D. Two-Word Expressions and Kastner "Wortfelder" . . 71
E. Enallage in Prose 73
F. Latin Enallage 74

Index Locorum 76

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is a slightly revised version of my 1972 Harvard University doctoral dissertation.

The topic was suggested to me by Professor Benedict Einarson: in the course of a conversation on poetic language he mentioned Aeschylus' κυμάτων ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα as an expression worth studying. But I have not had the benefit of his advice since 1966 and may have proceeded on lines quite different from what he had in mind.

Many friends have given me help, mostly by calling passages to my attention: Ann Bergren, Anthony Carnicelli, Kenneth Chakemian, Donald Cooper, Eric Hegsted, Jeffrey Henderson, Justina Winston Gregory, Sheila Murnaghan, Nancy Rabinowitz, Catherine P. Roth.

I also wish to thank Professors Wendell Clausen and John Finley for reading an early draft and making valuable suggestions. The publisher's reader called several important articles to my attention and their Classical Editor, Mr. T. A. Edridge, has been patient and helpful in dealing with a novice.

I am especially grateful to Professor Gregory Nagy for unstinting advice and encouragement.

New Haven, Connecticut — V.B.
February, 1973

ABBREVIATED REFERENCES

The abbreviations used in this study are generally those of *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, supplemented occasionally by those in LSJ. Unless otherwise noted in the text, references are either *ad loc.* or to the pages indicated in the entries below.

Barrett	W. S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964).
Bernhardy	G. Bernhardy, *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der Griechischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1829), pp. 425-7.
Bowra	C. M. Bowra, *Pindar* (Oxford, 1964).
Broadhead	H. D. Broadhead, *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1960).
Bruhn	Ewald Bruhn, *Anhang. Sophokles, erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauk,* Achtes Bändchen (Berlin, 1899), p. 7. Bruhn (I) and (II) are explained on p. 5, n. 1 of this study.
Dale	A. M. Dale, *Euripides Alcestis* (Oxford, 1954).
Dodds	E. R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae* (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1960).
Fraenkel	Eduard Fraenkel, *Aeschylus Agamemnon* (Oxford, 1950).
Gildersleeve	Basil L. Gildersleeve, *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York, 1890).
Gomme	A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1956).
Groeneboom	P. Groeneboom, *Aeschylus' Agamemnon* (Groningen, 1944), *Aeschylus' Choephoroi* (Groningen, 1949), *Aischylos' Perser* (German translation by H. Sönnichsen, Göttingen, 1960 of Dutch original, The Hague, 1930), *Aeschylus' Zeven Tegen Thebe* (Amsterdam, 1966).
Headlam	W. Headlam, "Metaphor, with a Note on Transference of Epithets", *CR*, 16 (1902), pp. 434 f.
Householder-Nagy	F. Householder and G. Nagy, "Greek", *Current Trends in Linguistics,* IX (1972), pp. 735-816.
Jebb	R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments* (Cambridge, 1885-1902).
Kaibel	G. Kaibel, *Sophokles Elektra* (Leipzig, 1896).
Kamerbeek	J. C. Kamerbeek, *The Plays of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1953-).
Kastner	W. Kastner, *Die griechischen Adjective zweier Endungen auf* -ΟΣ (Heidelberg, 1967).
Kühner-Gerth	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache,* II. Satzlehre, Erster Band (3rd ed.; Hannover and Leipzig, 1898), p. 263.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon,* 9th rev. ed. by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie (Oxford, 1940).
LSJ *Suppl.*	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon. A Supplement,* eds. E. A. Barber et al. (Oxford, 1968).
Lobeck	C. A. Lobeck, *Sophocles Aiax* (2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1835), pp. 72-6.

Long	A. A. Long, *Language and Thought in Sophocles* (London, 1968).
Matthiä	A. Matthiä, *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik, Zweiter Teil, Syntax* (Leipzig, 1835), p. 1003.
Mooney	G. W. Mooney, *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (London, 1912).
Owen	A. S. Owen, *Euripides Ion* (Oxford, 1939).
Page	D. L. Page, *Euripides Medea* (Oxford, 1938).
Pearson	A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1917).
Schneidewin	F. W. Schneidewin, *Sophokles Elektra II Fünftes Bändchen* (9th ed. prepared by August Nauck; Berlin, 1893).
Schwyzer	E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik* Vol. II. *Syntax und Syntaktische Stilistik = Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* II.1.2 (Munich, 1966).
Sidgwick	A. Sidgwick, *Aeschylus Choephoroi* (Oxford, 1884).
Tucker	T. G. Tucker, *The Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1908).
Verrall	A. W. Verrall, *The Seven Against Thebes* (London, 1887).
Wackernagel	J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax, Erste Reihe* (2nd ed.; Basel, 1926).
Wecklein	N. Wecklein, ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΑ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ, II (Athens, 1896), III (Leipzig, 1910).
West	M. L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford, 1966).
Wilamowitz	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides Herakles* (2nd ed.; Berlin, 1895), pp. 114 f.
Williger	E. Williger, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Komposita der griechischen Dichter des 5. Jahrhunderts* (*Forschungen z. griechischen u. lateinischen Grammatik 8. Heft*; Göttingen, 1928).

CHAPTER ONE

ENALLAGE: IS THERE SUCH A THING?

As I will use the term, enallage is the transfer to the governing substantive of an adjective which by logic, or at least convention, belongs with an expressed dependent genitive. (For the history of the term see Appendix A.) The most famous example of enallage occurs in Sophocles:

Ant. 793-4 lyr. σὺ καὶ τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν
ξύναιμον ἔχεις ταράξας

Phrases in which the inflections do not satisfy this definition, though the semantical outcome is similar, will be called "quasi-enallages". A variety of expressions come under this rubric:

Il. 2.54 Νεστορέῃ παρὰ νηὶ Πυλοιγενέος βασιλῆος

We expect the genitive of the noun Νέστωρ, not merely the genitive of the adjective Νεστόρεος.

Pind. *Ol.* 1.82-3 τά κέ τις ἀνώνυμον
γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἕψοι

The transfer is from a word in the nominative.

Pind. *Pyth.* 10.20-1 φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν μετατροπίαις

The adjective, which ordinarily would be made to agree with θεῶν (see p. 45), agrees instead with μετατροπίαις; but the genitive is governed by a preposition, so μετατροπίαις is not the governing substantive.

Eur. *Alc.* 261 lyr. ὑπ' ὀφρύσι κυαναυγέσι

Dale: "Possibly the epithet 'dark-gleaming' is more naturally used of the eyes than of the brows... but even so this might be no more than a 'transferred epithet', not overbold in lyric diction". Again, it cannot be an enallage because no word in the genitive for eyes appears in the passage.

Adjectives falling in any case and nouns in the genitive can express an immense variety of logical relationships (Meillet-Vendryes, pp. 561 ff., 586). This flexibility often makes it difficult, perhaps impossible, to say whether a particular expression is

metaphorical.[1] LSJ s.v. ὅμαιμος renders ὅμαιμος φόνος (Aesch. *Eum.* 212) "murder by one near of kin" and the adjective in νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον "between kinsmen". These translations exclude metaphor, i.e. they prevent our thinking that an adjective ordinarily applied to men is given to their acts. If, as here, the evidence does not clearly point one way or another, we should resist any interpretation that flattens poetry into prose. Also, instances of "adjective for genitive" are far more common in poetry than in prose, and prose instances seem contextually conditioned (see p. 41 and Appendix D). This suggests that metaphor, not just the wide semantic range of adjectives, is at work.

Thus I would argue that in two Sophoclean expressions, the model enallage νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον and κακὰ ἑκόντα κοὐκ ἄκοντα (*OT* 1229-30),[2] we are not meant to take the adjectives as meaning no more than "pertaining to kin" and "pertaining to unwillingness"; and, of course, strife is not literally kindred, and men, not their deeds, are unwilling. These examples show that the distinction between an enallage and a simple transferred epithet is not arbitrary, for the way figurative language enters our consciousness is not the same in both. If, as in the first, a poet transfers an adjective away from a word which appears in the utterance, he places a far greater emphasis on the manipulation than if he omits the word to which the adjective belongs in ordinary language, as in the second. One way he compels the audience to notice the switch; the other way he permits them to understand the phrase as being a metaphor of the usual type, viz. that in which the literal meaning is implicit. (Of course the metaphor may be "dead", in which case the poet demands no mental effort on the part of his audience beyond that which they exert to understand purely literal language).

Examples in which the writer includes the word from which the adjective is transferred but puts the noun in a case other than the genitive, like Pindar's τις ἀνώνυμον γῆρας, are much closer to enallage.[3] But this type is very rare. The switch in concord of ad-

---

[1] By "metaphor" I mean not what I. A. Richards calls the "omnipresent principle of language", but poetic metaphor, or what H. Konrad calls "aesthetic" metaphor: see R. Wellek and A. Warren, *Theory of Literature* (New York, 1942), p. 185.

[2] Cf. the line Shakespeare gives to Desdemona: "Alas, what ignorant sin have I committed?" (*Othello* 4.2.70).

[3] The position and specificity of the word which logic would give the adjec-

jective away from the genitive is so much more frequent that we are entitled to select precisely this inflectional category as the distinguishing feature of a discrete phenomenon in Greek.

Enallage bridges the figurative and the prosaic. The effect is paradoxical. On the one hand, if a reader or listener takes an enallage literally, i.e. if he follows the grammatical concord and fails to notice the transfer, he is forced to make metaphorical sense of the expression, find an *ad hoc* logical relation between the adjective and noun in agreement, or remain baffled. On the other, if he detects the enallage he can perceive the prosaic sense at once, and so is in danger of leaving his poetic faculty unexercised. The majority of modern readers, too accustomed to metaphor in their own language and too ready to substitute a commentator's rephrasing of an unusual locution for the actual text, tend to pass rapidly over the literal expression; when they come across an enallage they either follow the grammar without observing that the noun in the genitive presents a problem, or they transfer the adjective back to the genitive and regard the standard expression and the deviation as equivalents.

Occasionally the literal reading of an enallage makes the expression meaningless, as in Aesch. *Ag.* 504:

δεκάτῳ ... φέγγει ... ἔτους

But in the vast majority of examples one can make some sense of the adjective taken with the governing substantive.[1] Because the two ways of reading an enallage involve different ways of understanding words, it would be misleading to say that the adjective is ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. Rather, we have a narrow type of ambiguity: enallage provides two alternatives. It is now a virtual commonplace of criticism that "The machinations of ambiguity are among the very roots of poetry".[2] But we are not dealing with expressions which defy analysis in the way described by Virginia Woolf in "On Not Knowing Greek":

---

tive has much to do with how strongly the transfer is felt. ὃς ἂν τούτων τι δρᾷ, φόνον προκεῖσθαι δημόλευστον (Soph. *Ant.* 35-6) is less striking than ὁ ῥιπτὸς Ἰφίτου μόρος (*Trach.* 357).

[1] Cf. G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), p. 145.

[2] W. Empson quoted, and emphatically endorsed, by R. Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics", in *Style and Language*, ed. T. A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 171.

> There is an ambiguity which is the mark of the highest poetry; we cannot know exactly what it means. Take this from the *Agamemnon* for instance—
>
> ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις ἔρρει πᾶσ' Ἀφροδίτα.
>
> The meaning is just on the far side of language. It is the meaning which in moments of astonishing excitement and stress we perceive in our minds without words.[1]

If there is ambiguity of this elevated type in an enallage (and the evidence shows that the device is by and large *not* used to convey "astonishing excitement and stress") it comes from a literal reading: it does not, properly speaking, come from the enallage itself.

There are, in general, two areas of difficulty which can obstruct a decision whether a particular expression is an enallage: textual and grammatical. In establishing the text we must recognize two contradictory processes, the tendency of scribes to assimilate cases of adjoining words, which creates an enallage where there was none, and their readiness to make regular a construction they did not understand—a practice too frequently shared by textual critics who do not keep enallage in mind. On the whole, I think the first error is less frequent than the second, and therefore probability favors invoking the principle of *lectio difficilior* when the MSS. present a choice. (The variants usually differ in only one or two letters). I have tried to be scrupulous about showing the relevant textual material at least once for every example discussed. It is hoped, moreover, that this study will show enough about the use of enallage to aid textual critics when they confront a possible instance.

"La langue est un système où tout se tient" (Meillet), but it is also true that "All grammars leak" (Sapir). The grammatical difficulty, though just as formidable as the textual problem, at least allows a greater range of evidence to be brought to bear. Many scholars, apparently convinced that enallage does not (perhaps *should* not, because it seems illogical) exist, have produced a variety of syntactical explanations meant to banish the device from Greek, or at least to trivialize the phenomenon. Without yet considering the individual theories, I will state three *a priori* objections which apply to nearly all of them: (1) They fail to account for the limited distribution of enallage, both in genres and contexts, (2) they ignore the difference in nuance between alternate forms of expression,

---

[1] *The Common Reader* ("Harvest Book"; New York, n.d.), p. 32.

and (3) they are forced to adduce a variety of explanations when a single, economical one will do.

The "Compound" Theory

Many apparent instances of enallage are explained as noun + adjective combinations in which the two substantives have merged into an *ad hoc* "compound".[1] Wilamowitz makes a very general claim for this interpretation:

> τἀμὰ πεδία γῆς, "die Fluren meines Landes". Es ist im Griechischen ein völlig zu Recht bestehender Sprachgebrauch, dass ein Adjectiv zu dem regierenden Substantiv tritt, auch wenn es dem Sinne nach eigentlich nur zu einem von jenem abhängigen Genetiv gehört. Die Rhetorik nennt das Enallage; in Wahrheit kann eine flektierende Sprache kaum anders verfahren. Man macht sich das klar, sobald man sich die Substantiva nur zu einem Kompositum verwachsen denkt. "Himmlische Lebenskraft, australische Pflanzenwelt, gesunder Menschenverstand, griechische Götterlehre" sind wohl verstattet, und die "reitende Artilleriekaserne", der "lederne Handschumacher" sind ganz sprachgemass, mögen die Pedanten es nicht verstehen und in ihrem papiernen Deutsch durch Reitende-Artillerie-Kaserne ersetzen.

This view is endorsed by, among others, Broadhead (ad *Pers.* 250), Wecklein (ad *Eum.* 292), Kaibel (ad *El.* 1374), Schneidewin (ad *El.* 1390), Kamerbeek (ad *OT* 1032), Jebb (ad *Phil.* 952), and Owen (ad *Ion* 1337).[2]

This type of explanation is trivial. There is indeed an inherent semantic unity formed by a noun and its dependent genitive: "Comme complément de nom, le génitif [adnominal] exprime ce qui est de la sphère du nom, ce qui appartient au nom et le complète" (Meillet-Vendryes, p. 561). The "compound" theory would be a sufficient exegesis of these passages if one could show that the

---

[1] A terminological note: Fraenkel (ad Aesch. *Ag.* 504) calls these combinations "a particular form of 'enallage' "; similarly, Bruhn recognizes two categories of enallage: "I. Das Adjectiv gehört dem Sinne nach zu dem Ganzen, welches das regierende Substantiv und der Genetiv bilden" and "II. Das Adjectivum gehört lediglich zu dem Genetiv"; but Owen (ad Eur. *Ion* 1486 f.) states that they "are not real instances of hypallage (i.e. enallage)".

[2] I take it that Gildersleeve (p. cxv) is espousing something like a "compound" theory in his explanation of enallage: "...while hypallage [i.e. enallage] is not the result of the order of words, it is the result of the close knitting of words".

adjective was not, even momentarily, understood with the noun falling in the same case. To do this one would need to point to some special circumstances which, like the *constructio ad sensum* (see Kühner-Gerth, p. 58), disrupt the language's formal rules. In *Od.* 11. 90-1, for example, the ghost *is* Tiresias, so the masculine participle is not remarkable: ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχὴ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο χρύσεον σκῆπτρον ἔχων. But the difference between prosaic and poetic usage shows that the natural language did not treat as a compound even a common combination preserving the genitive ending of the dependent noun. In the phrase τελευτὴ τοῦ βίου (or βιότοιο) "ein mit einem attributiven Genetive verbundenes Substantiv [stellt] eine Gesamtbegriff [dar] (Kühner-Gerth, p. 607). The combination occurs many times in prose, but only in poetry (and there is only one instance known to me) is τελευτή modified by an adjective:

Anth. Pal. 7.334.3 δι' ἐμὴν βιότοιο τελευτήν

No other such direct comparison is possible, since the other noun combinations which scholars have called virtual compounds are not exactly paralleled in prose (cf. p. 67).

Dodds explains Eur. *Bacch.* 1327-8 σὸς παῖς παιδὸς in the typical fashion: "not σοῦ since παῖς παιδὸς is treated as a single expression = 'grandson' ". παῖς παιδός does of course mean "grandson", but prose regularly used υἱδοῦς, which precludes a problem in the concord of an adjective. (παιδόπαις is preserved on *IG* 12(2).169.)

Word order in the supposed "compound" expressions often accentuates the word boundaries. To be sure, the two substantives sometimes stand together:

Soph. *Ant.* 793-4 lyr. ... νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν
ξύναιμον

But we also have the two parts which are claimed to have grown together separated:

Aesch. *Ag.* 504 δεκάτῳ σε φέγγει τῷδ' ἀφικόμην ἔτους

Soph. *OT* 1032 ποδῶν ἂν ἄρθρα μαρτυρήσειεν τὰ σά

Eur. *Ion* 1486-7 lyr. δεκάτῳ δέ σε μηνὸς ἐν
κύκλῳ

It is altogether possible that a Greek speaker would, after a moment's hesitation, apprehend the two nouns as a pair jointly

modified by the adjective. But even so, he would be perfectly aware of the contrast with the natural language.[1]

Assimilation

Williger (pp. 9 f.) was convinced that enallage resulted from a "natural linguistic phenomenon" rather than any special feature of the Greek language: "Die sog. Enallage, die bei Pindar und in der Tragödie eine haüfige Erscheinung ist, haben wir als eine Attraktion oder besser Assimilation des zu einem Genetiv gehörigen Adjectivs an das übergeordnete Substantiv zu verstehen ... Unser sprachliches Empfinden mag daran Anstoss nehmen; dass es sich um eine natürliche sprachliche Erscheinung handelt, versteht man, wenn man sich erinnert, welche Rolle die Assimilation der Wortformen in der griechischen Sprache überhaupt spielt (darüber handelt jetzt im Zusammenhang Wackernagel, Vorl[esungen] über Synt[ax] I 49 ff.)".

Wackernagel himself did not treat enallage, either in his discussion of assimilation or elsewhere in his writings.[2] Still, reasoning *a priori* one might apply his general formulation (p. 49) to enallage: "Erst seitdem das psychische Moment in den Vordergrund der Betrachtung gelangen ist, hat man die Sache verstehen gelernt. Es ist einer der starken Triebe, der das Sprechen beherrscht und die Reproduktion des Sprachgutes beeinflusst, Nebeneinandergestelltes auszugleichen, indem entweder etwas, was für einen spätern Teil des zu Sagenden vorschwebt, antizipiert wird, oder indem man auf einer Ausdrucksform beharrt. Man spricht von regressiver Assimilation, wenn etwas Späteres antizipiert wird, und von progressiver Assimilation, wenn ein Beharren auf etwas schon Gebrachtem vorliegt". But objections, fatal in combination if not singly, can be made to the assimilation theory of enallage.

One can object on the ground of economy of explanation, since

---

[1] A neat example of the difficulty in determining whether the "compound" theory is applicable: in the *Anhang* to the Schneidewin-Nauck edition of Sophocles Bruhn includes πολιᾶς πόντου θινός (*Phil.* 1123-4) in his second category (see p. 5, n. 1), whereas Schneidewin had explained "πόντου θινός bildet einen Begriff, wozu dann πολιᾶς tritt". (This is an unusual enallage: cf. p. 64).

[2] He borrows an example in English from Jespersen, "She is both their mothers", to show assimilation of number, but it would be far-fetched to claim that "both" stands for the possessive prepositional phrase "of both" (p. 51).

several forms of assimilation are needed to cover various cases of enallage. In ὁμοσπόροις ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἱμάτων (Aesch. *Ag.* 1509-10 lyr.) the direct juxtaposition of ὁμοσπόροις and ἐπιρροαῖσιν would account for the adjective's being in the dative and the assimilation would be, in Wackernagel's phrase, "regressive". But in Eur. *Hel.* 400 ἐπ' οἶδμα πόντιον γλαυκῆς ἁλός the putative assimilation, again stemming from the words' immediate juxtaposition, would be "progressive". Then, one would have to claim that the proximity of the adjective to its logical referent in Soph. *Aj.* 249 lyr. θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγόν does not prevent assimilation to the case of a noun further removed. Recourse to the "compound" theory of enallage does not provide a satisfactory escape from this problem.[1] To maintain both positions is to claim at one moment that immediate proximity of words (regardless of the meanings) causes assimilation and, at another, that the semantic anticipation of the non-genitive noun of an *ad hoc* "compound" (even though further from the adjective than the genitive) has the same effect.

And it is surprising that this form of assimilation should appear in such a limited distribution when assimilation of relative pronouns, which also involves cases, is so widespread in Greek.[2] An alleged assimilation executed only in special circumstances of genre and context is not likely to be an assimilation at all. It is just possible that early instances of enallage came about through assimilation, but quite certainly expressions descended from them would have been interpreted as transferred epithets (cf. Wackernagel, p. 51).

Defining or Appositional Genitive

In a few instances apparent enallage is explained as being, instead, a case of defining or appositional genitive. Such a genitive does of course exist, but its use in prose is largely confined to place names and genitives of articular infinitives (Kühner-Gerth, pp. 264 f.).

On Aesch. *Sept.* 64 κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ Verrall comments:

---

[1] The theories are combined by Williger, who asserts (p. 10) that the compactness of expression makes assimilation easier, indirectly by Wilamowitz (cf. his remarks ad Eur. *HF* 450 and 468), and evidently, by Kamerbeek, who speaks of attraction by enallage in Soph. *OT* 1376.

[2] In Latin, on the other hand, enallage is attested far more often than assimilation of relatives: see Wackernagel, p. 55.

"στρατοῦ genitive defining; 'a landwave in form of an army'. The epithet χερσαῖον qualifies the metaphor as in ἄρδις ἄπυρος of the gadfly's sting, *PV* 905 [vv. 879-80 in O.C.T.]". But enallage is likely because Greek habitually attaches an adjective, typically πεζός or ναυτικός, to στρατός in order to distinguish "fleet" from "army" or uses the adjective alone, with στρατός understood.

The adjective in line 1076 of the same play is customarily applied to men:

anap. ἀλλοδάπῳ / κύματι φωτῶν

ἀλλοδαπῶν v.l. in Φ ἀλλοδάπῳ rell.

Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 412 ῥεῦμα Περσικοῦ στρατοῦ. Tucker sees that enallage is at least one reason to reject the *varia lectio*: "It is a mistake to alter to ἀλλοδαπῶν (1) because φωτῶν is simply added to define the metaphor ... (2) because the attachment of the epithet to the governing rather than the governed noun is favoured by the tragedians". Both κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ and ἀλλοδάπῳ κύματι φωτῶν are no more easily understood as metaphors defined by genitives than as metaphors enhanced by enallage. After all, enallage is, in tragedy, the more common grammatical phenomenon.

Soph. *OT* 832-3 βαίην ἄφαντος πρόσθεν ἢ τοιάνδε' ἰδεῖν
κηλῖδ' ἐμαυτῷ συμφορᾶς ἀφιγμένην

To Jebb this shows a hyphenated pair; Kamerbeek explains that "συμφορᾶς is explicative genitive". But when one considers the great emotion attached to the word συμφορά (euphemistic for "guilt" or "crime": see Jebb on v. 99) in this play, it seems wrong to separate it from τοιάνδ' entirely.

With greater certainty we can defend the existence of enallage in *OT* 532-3, where the genitive is regarded as qualitative rather than defining or appositional:[1]

τοσόνδ' ἔχεις / τόλμης πρόσωπον

Kamerbeek comments: "τόλμης is qualitative genitive equivalent to τολμηρόν just as in ἄλλο πρᾶγμα βλάβης Aesch. *Ag.* 1535 βλάβης amounts to βλαβερόν (see Fraenkel). τόλμης πρόσωπον = 'effrontery', 'barefacedness' and τοσόνδ' is construed with the phrase felt as a unity (no need to speak of hypallage [i.e. enallage])". Since τοσόνδε refers to degree, it must be taken with the τόλμης part of the supposed

[1] Even as a qualitative genitive it is dependent on πρόσωπον, thus we can have enallage, not quasi-enallage.

"unity". That the qualitative genitive takes the place of an adjective is of stylistic importance but, unlike the defining or appositional genitive, it does not make the presence of enallage less probable.

Partitive Genitive in Expressions for Land and Sea

The following discussion of enallages which include the genitive of words for land and sea shows the necessity of employing analytical tools better than a "Sprachgefühl" directed to literal translations into English or any other modern language. The particular problem here, as often, arises from the flexibility of the Greek genitive.

Headlam states the problem and offers a compromise:

> The MS. reading in *Eum.* 292 ἀλλ' εἴτε χώρας ἐν τόποις Λιβυστικοῖς is generally taken as an example of... transference of epithet, and so it may be; it would be equally good, however, if χώρας meant 'the Earth', a partitive genitive substituted for γῆς or χθονός as in Herodas 3.75 οὐδ' ὅκου χώρης is for οὐδ' ὅπου γῆς. There is the same uncertainty in other phrases of this type: Simonid. *A.P.* vii 496 Σκιρωνικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης, Cratin... [220] in burlesque, καὶ Λεβάδειαν, Βοιώτιον οὖθαρ ἀρούρης. Nonn. *D.* 30.209 ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴν Ἦλιδα ναιετάουσαν, Ὀλύμπιον οὖδας ἀρούρης. 10.139 ὑπὸ κλίμα Λυδὸν ἀρούρης 14.270 περὶ Φρύγα κόλπον ἀρούρης. What is the true nature of the formula? Is the genitive possessive, as in Ar. *Av.* 250 ἐπὶ πόντιον οἶδμα θαλάσσης ... Nonn. 44.1 Ἰλλυρίης Δαυλάντιον ἔθνος ἀρούρης, 48.241 παρὰ σφυρὰ Δίνδυμα πέτρης? Or is it partitive as Quint. 2.651 would seem to be, κατ' Ἠλύσιον πέδον αἴης? [1] I conceive that in the uncertain cases the writer himself would have been wise to say that you might take your choice.

Soph. *OC* 297 πατρῷον ἄστυ γᾶς

Wilamowitz translates "die Hauptstadt des Vaterlandes"; against this, Jebb pronounces: "not for πατρῴας γῆς ἄστυ but simply 'his father's city in the land' (the gen. γῆς as 45)". Jebb's parallel relies on retaining the MS. reading, but Musgrave's γε is probably right. (The MS. reading has an ugly sound and ὡς ... γε is a common combination. [2]) Schwyzer (p. 114) also keeps the MS. reading and translates "in diesem Lande", but his other examples of this kind of partitive genitive are not quite parallel in that they are all proper nouns. All other citations of γῆ and χῶρος in the pertinent sections

---

[1] Note that Quintus includes που in his phrase.

[2] Cf. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1954), p. 143, where the emendation is printed without comment.

of Schwyzer (pp. 113 f.) and Kühner-Gerth (pp. 338-41) include either an adverb like ποῦ, πόθεν, πανταχῇ or an article. (A phrase which adds Θήβης to γῆς, *Ant.* 937 anap., is evidence neither way.)

Even if the evidence for a separable γῆς were stronger, it still could be argued that πατρῷον would be "partially taken" with γῆς simply because that adjective very commonly modifies that noun—see LSJ s.v. πατρῷος. πάτρα and πατρίς reinforce the association.

At Aesch. *Sept.* 1007-8 (in the closing section regarded by most editors as spurious) we find

> Ἐτεοκλέα μὲν τόνδ' ἐπ' εὐνοίᾳ χθονὸς
> θάπτειν ἔδοξε γῆς φίλαις κατασκαφαῖς

It would certainly fit to understand γῆς as meaning "in the earth", but after ἐπ' εὐνοίᾳ χθονός it would be more pointed to have an enallage.[1]

It is even more certain than the genitive of words for the sea was rarely, if ever, partitive. The relevant sections of Schwyzer and Kühner-Gerth have no such citations; and LSJ gives no instance where the adverbs which accompany partitive genitives denoting place (the adverbs are listed by Kühner-Gerth, p. 340) are used in a marine context. (Hdt. 7.106.1 has τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου πανταχῇ, but here Ἑλλήσποντος refers to the "adjacent country" [LSJ s.v. πανταχῇ]).

The first example from Nonnus introduces another problem of analysis, viz. whether to regard part-whole combinations like οὖδας ἀρούρης as a "hyphenated pair" modified by the adjective. I have already given my general objections to this explanation (pp. 5 ff.); here I will consider its application to two specific semantic fields.

The following syntagmata are possible enallages:

Aesch. *Sept.* 304-5 lyr. ποῖον δ' ἀμείψεσθε γαίας πέδον
τᾶσδ' ἄρειον

Eur. *El.* 1 Ὦ γῆς παλαιὸν ἄργος

(Denniston: "ἄργος with a small alpha is, I think, sound. The word originally means 'plain' [cf. αἶα 'land' and Αἶα part of Thessaly".].)

Eur. *HF* 468 τἀμὰ πεδία γῆς

In a long passage of dochmiacs we find γᾶς ἐμᾶς πεδία (Aesch.

---

[1] It must be admitted that Aesch. *Ag.* 507 φιλτάτου τάφου μέρος makes enallage far less likely.

Sept. 83).[1] In the absence of any prose instances of πεδίον + γῆς + adjective (or any equivalent combination), I would argue that the dochmiacs are most likely to represent the treatment that the natural language would give the words: the chorus is excited and speaking in the meter most suitable for agitated expression (cf. p. 49). As a matter of relativity, a deviation from standard grammar is less probable here than in, e.g., the formal language of an apostrophe to the earth. (The argument must be indirect since the very pleonasm of these expressions is alien to the natural language.)

More generally, we can state that the following rule describes the usual practice in Greek: when one noun referring to a part is accompanied by a dependent genitive denoting the whole, an adjective which could be applied to either noun appearing alone is attributed to the noun in the genitive case. It must be emphasized that an observed regularity involving two words is no conclusive evidence for what is regular if a third word is added. This is perhaps obvious, but there is a strong tendency in discussing enallage to deduce more than one can from two-word usages.[2] (Wilamowitz ad Eur. *HF* 410 contends that Greek is prone to make the adjective non-genitive, but he offers no evidence beyond a reference to his general attack on enallage [quoted on p. 5].)

One needs recourse to this rule in classifying examples of three-word expressions for the sea: [3]

Hymn. Hom. *Cer.* 15 ἁλμυρὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης

Aesch. fr. 150 Nauck δελφινοφόρον πεδίον πόντου

Eur. *Hel.* 400 ἐπ' οἶδμα πόντιον γλαυκῆς ἁλός

Eur. *HF* 410 lyr. Εὔξεινον οἶδμα λίμνας
"Αξεινον Meineke

Eur. *Tro.* 1-2 Αἴγαιον ἁλμυρὸν βάθος πόντου

Lyrica Adespota 939.19 Page οἶδμα ἁλιπόρφυρον λίμνας

Ion Trag. 60 πόντου πεδίον Αἰγαῖον

BMus. Inscr. 1012.5 κατ' Αἰγαίην πόντου πλάκα [4]

D.P. 37 'Ηῷον καλέουσι καὶ 'Ινδικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης

Nonnus *Dion.* 43.225 Ἴσθμιον οἶδμα Παλληνίδος ἅλμης

---

[1] Cf. also *Supp.* 260 αὐτῆς χώρας 'Απίας πέδον, *Pers.* 488 γῆς 'Αχαιίδος πέδον.

[2] Cf. p. 2 on ὅμαιμος φόνος and νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον.

[3] This list combines those of Headlam's examples not reproduced above (p. 10) and a few others.

[4] Attributed by Headlam, apparently in error, to the *Anth. Pal.*

With which cf.:

Il. 2.209 κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης

Od. 1.52-3 θαλάσσης / πάσης βένθεα

Alcman B 89.5 Page ἐν βένθεσσι πορφυρέας ἁλός

Even on the synchronic level, an analysis of these ornate expressions is difficult. The fifth-century examples can at least be compared with contemporary prose usage. οἶδμα is a purely poetic word: Antiphon 196.3 διὰ πόντιον οἶδμα is mock-heroic. Except for this passage, πόντιος is not found in prose until the fourth century (Aristotle and Theophrastus). The three-word expression is, of course, proper to poetry. Cases like τελευτᾷ δὲ ὁ Ἴστρος ἐς θάλασσαν ῥέων τὴν τοῦ Εὐξείνου πόντου (Hdt. 2.33.4) are quite different: the sea in general is mentioned first, then a specific part is given. Still, comparing Eur. *Tro.* 1-2 and Ion Trag. 60 with Herodotus' τῷ Αἰγαίῳ πόντῳ (2.97) and Thucydides' τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος (4.109.2), and comparing Eur. *HF* 410 with Herodotus' τὸν Εὔξεινον καλεόμενον πόντον (1.6.2) and Thucydides' τὸν Εὔξεινον πόντον (2.97.1), one can claim with some assurance that the adjective would seem transferred from the genitive.

Less easy to justify as enallage are Eur. *Hel.* 400 and Aristophanes *Av.* 250, especially in view of Antiphon's πόντιον οἶδμα, which suggests that the genitive was not needed to mark the utterance as in the high style. (For all we know it might have been recognized as two-thirds of an enallage.) ποντία θάλασσα and ποντία ἅλς are not attested and from the synchronic point of view would be redundant. But a diachronic exegesis shows that the redundancy is a later semantic development and, thereby, permits us to apply the general rule of adjective assignment posited above (p. 12).

According to the conventional wisdom, πόντος originally denoted the deep sea, as opposed to ἅλς, the coastal waters: "The distinction is no more absolute in Homer than it is in nature, but the phrase πόντος ἁλὸς πολιῆς in Φ 59 is unique in implying that the difference has been wholly forgotten".[1] Perhaps so, but there are good grounds

---

[1] D. H. F. Gray, "Homeric epithets for things", *CQ*, 61 (1947), p. 112 = *Language and Background of Homer*, ed. G. S. Kirk (Cambridge, 1964), p. 58, followed by D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley, 1959), p. 228.

for claiming that this expression reveals an *older* meaning of πόντος than "the deep sea". Benveniste has shown that Indo-Iranian *pánthāḥ* preserves the least common semantic denominator of its various Indo-European cognates (Greek πόντος, Latin *pons,* Armenian *hun,* etc.). *Pánthāḥ* is commonly translated "path", "chemin", but "Ce qui caractérise le pánthāḥ est qu'il n'est pas simplement le chemin en tant qu'espace à parcourir d'un point à un autre. Il implique peine, incertitude et danger... L'équivalent le plus approché sera plutôt 'franchissement' que 'chemin', et c'est bien ce sens qui explique la diversité des variantes attestés".[1] Householder and Nagy (p. 768) show that the original nuance is preserved in the Homeric collocation of πόντος and ἰχθυόεις. Coastal waters are often dangerous in the extreme, so πόντος ἁλός makes excellent sense from an etymological viewpoint; so do ποντία θάλασσα and ποντία ἅλς.[2]

When θάλασσα referred to a specific sea and was not modified by an adjective derived from a proper noun, the assumption was that the Mediterranean was meant. (Even with adjectives, θάλασσα is rarely used of any sea but the Mediterranean. A quick search in a few *indices nominum* turns up only Ἐρυθρὰ θάλαττα [Ar. *Av.* 145 and Hdt. 1.1 and frequently elsewhere] and Κασπίη θάλασσα [Hdt. 1.202]; when Thucydides speaks of the Tyrrhenian, which of course is within the Mediterranean, he uses πέλαγος, κόλπος, and πόντος.) This makes the Simonides passage (Σκιρωνικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης) troublesome. Σκιρωνικὴ θάλασσα would be a very odd expression for a small part of the Mediterranean.

There is some chance that the Aeschylus fragment is not an enallage: taking πεδίον as the surface of the water, it makes sense that an animal notorious for playing at the side of ships (Eur. *El.* 435-7 = Ar. *Ran.* 1317-8; Pind. fr. 220.2 Bowra) haunts the surface; a poet could ignore any excursions the dolphins might make to the βένθεα.

Enallage with Collective Nouns

In his short paragraph on enallage, Gildersleeve (p. cxv) asks, "If... the kine are dun, what trouble is given by βοῶν ξανθὰς ἀγέλας (P. 4.149)?" Compared with other types, the enallage with

[1] "Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction", *Word,* 10 (1954), p. 257 = *Problèmes de linguistique générale* (Paris, 1966), pp. 289-298.

[2] See Appendix B.

collective nouns is indeed colorless. In fact it is not self-evident that these constructions should be classified as enallages at all.

To some extent logic plays a role. What is true of a group considered as a whole may not be true of its individual members. There is no enallage when Homer speaks of the Λυκίων μέγα ἔθνος (*Il.* 12.330), since the army is not composed of Sarpedons and Glaucuses. On the other hand, if the adjective applies to all members of a class, it more naturally modifies the collective noun: had Sophocles written ἰχθύων πλωτῶν γένος, instead of ἰχθύων πλωτὸν γένος (fr. 941.9 Pearson), it might suggest that some species of fish do not swim.

But in general, convention and the desire to stress either the collective entity or the individuals determine which noun gets the adjective. With considerable hesitation, I would claim that, *ceteris paribus*, the adjective modifying the collective makes the more elevated expression. At any rate, the sense of displacement of the adjective is so weak that we can safely exclude the collective-noun enallage as a type productive of other forms of enallage.

Periphrasis and Enallage

It will be convenient to consider two separate but related questions in this section: Did the Homeric periphrasis give rise to enallage? Can a periphrasis contain a true enallage?

ἱερὸν μένος + genitive of a name and ἱερὴ ἲς + genitive of a name are common Homeric periphrases. In the *Odyssey*, for example, we have seven examples each of ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο and ἱερὴ ἲς Τηλεμάχοιο. Householder and Nagy (pp. 760f.) have suggested that these examples, "which at first sight seem like stylistically motivated periphrastic constructs, actually turn out to be reflexes from a prehistoric period when the so-called Caland's rule was still operative". Caland's rule prohibits the formation of the compound ἱερομένης; *ἱειμένης was a possible formation, but the first part "could no longer be perceived as related to ἱερο-". But there is a third possibility besides phonological and morphological necessity and stylistic motivation, viz. a theory of human action.

R. Schmitt [1] argues that μένος, though not "Kraft" itself, involves "etwas dynamisches, krafterfülltes". It is a force noticed by

[1] *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1967), pp. 109 ff.

the person, but only to a slight degree is it under his control. It is something supernatural and responsible for great deeds. Naturally enough, Indo-European *ménes gets the epithet *isə₁ró, cognate to ἱερός. It is crucial to realize that the person denoted by both these periphrases is not himself ἱερός. In only two instances does ἱερός directly modify words for persons:[1] ἱερούς πυλαωρούς (*Il.* 24.681) and Ἀργείων ἱερὸς στρατός (*Od.* 24.81). J. P. Locher[2] discusses these apparent exceptions together with the locution φυλάκων ἱερὸν τέλος (*Il.* 10.56) and concludes that we are dealing here with an extraordinary, superhuman attribute of certain collective bodies, not of individuals. At any event, ἱερός never directly qualifies a man's name in Homer. Thus there is no chance that a Greek familiar with Homer's diction would take the adjective as transferred from the genitive, even if he did not know the theory behind the periphrasis. (δῖος and θεῖος commonly modify words for men, but directly, not in periphrastic constructions.)

Similarly, there is no transfer of epithet in ἱερὸν μένος Ἠελίοιο (*Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 271) as the sun is never called ἱερός in Homer. And we have μένος ὀξέος ἠελίοιο (Hes. *Op.* 414, *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 374), but never, *metro neglecto*, μένος ὀξὺ ἠελίοιο. (Homer does have αὐγὴ ἠελίου ὀξεῖα [*Il.* 17.371-2], but there is nothing startling in calling sun rays sharp or penetrating. Perhaps αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἠελίου [*Theog.* 426] is "enallage inversa" (see p. 43); more likely, it is just free variation.)

One could possibly construe as enallage κρατερὴ ἲς Ὀδυσῆος (*Il.* 23.720), since κρατερός can modify words for men directly, μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο (*Il.* 21.195: cf. πέλαγος μέγα [*Il.* 14.16]), and μέγα σθένος Ἠετίωνος (*Il.* 23.827: cf. μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ [*Il.* 2.816]). But as with μένος, ἲς and σθένος fully deserve their adjectives.

Homeric periphrases with words meaning head, like βοῶν ἴφθιμα κάρηνα (*Il.* 23.260) and νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα (*Od.* 10.521), are also not to be understood as enallage. Two recent articles on ἴφθιμος put forward different meanings for the adjective, but both suggest that there is something special about the head which entitles it to

---

[1] Schmitt (*op. cit.*, p. 110, n. 667a) writes, "Personen werden selbst niemals als ἱερός bezeichnet", apparently excluding "gate-keepers" and "army" as designations of "Personen". Similarly, Locher (see next note) writes, "Er [man] selber heisst direkt nicht ἱερός" (p. 76).

[2] *Untersuchungen zu* ἱερός *hauptsächlich bei Homer* (Bern, 1963), pp. 56 f.

being characterized for its own sake. J. Warden[1] argues that ἴφθιμος qualifies words for human and divine heads because one of its putative meanings, "seedy, endowed with rich soul-material", aptly describes the receptacle of cerebral fluid, which early belief associated with seed. His discussion makes good sense of νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, which otherwise might look like an enallage. A. Athanassakis[2] rejects Warden's definitions of ἴφθιμος and offers in its place "highly valued", a meaning directly derived from his proposed etymology, * (ϝ)ἰφίτιμος. He observes that it was common in Homeric society to attach a value to a man's life, a value often expressed by reference to his head. The immense value of oxen is similarly expressed. Athanassakis states that the expression βοῶν ἴφθιμα κάρηνα "may still be a periphrasis [i.e. a *mere* periphrasis] for ἰφθίμους βόας", but his own line of argument seems to me to favor understanding "head" as a unit of value. Again, there is reason to regard the head as more than a stylistically motivated stand-in for the whole man or animal, but Warden's explanation would make the case against enallage more compelling.[3]

Because attention was concentrated on the heads, or for metrical reasons, or because κάρηνα + genitive functioned as a compound, adjectives were added in the neuter nominative/accusative. (Cf. pp. 5 ff. The "compound" theory of enallage would gain considerable credibility if there were prose instances of enallage with κάρηνα [or κάρα] + genitive of the word for some animal.) These Homeric periphrases may have suggested a few enallages in the fifth-century; but they were certainly not productive of enallage in general.[4]

On the ground that ἱερὸν μένος + genitive was not understood as an enallage, we can be sure that Mimnermus did not intend an enallage when he wrote δριμὺ μένος κραδίης (13.6).

---

[1] "ΙΦΘΙΜΟΣ", *Phoenix* 23 (1969), pp. 153-7.

[2] "An inquiry into the etymology and meaning of ἴφθιμος in the early epic", *Glotta* 49 (1971), pp. 1-21, esp. pp. 13-16.

[3] There are other possible reasons for singling out the head, e.g. counting men or animals by heads is the easiest way; see Warden (*op. cit.*) pp. 155 f.

[4] Enallage seems least likely in the most stereotyped of fifth-century periphrases, those formed with words for head, like Sophocles' Ὦ κοινὸν αὐτάδελφον Ἰσμήνης κάρα (*Ant.* 1) and θεῖον Ἰοκάστης κάρα (*OT* 1235). Here one would equate the part and the whole more readily than when presented with a novel periphrasis (cf. pp. 19 f.). (Yet I suspect that the figure appears in A. E. Housman's "O suitably-attired-in-leather-boots/Head of a traveller", and, less obviously, in D. S. Raven's version ὦ ποδενδύτοισι δέρμασιν πρέπον/ κάρα πλανήτου [*Greece and Rome*, 2nd series 6 (1959), p. 14]).

Examples from poets who definitely included enallage in their repertory need to be examined individually.

Pind. *Pyth.* 4.144 σθένος ἀελίου χρύσεον

Most probably an enallage. σθένος may be μέγα, but it cannot literally be golden. Rumpel (*Lexicon Pindaricum* [Leipzig, 1883]) states that χρύσεος is here metaphorical for *lucidus, splendidus*, but I am convinced that it is best here, as elsewhere in reading Greek poetry, to begin by making what sense one can of the concrete meaning.

Aesch. *PV* 91 τὸν πανόπτην κύκλον ἡλίου

Perhaps an enallage if the phrase is to be translated "all-seeing circle of the sun" (D. Grene). The more interesting meaning, "Soleil, oeil qui vois tout" (P. Mazon), precludes enallage. (For the singular κύκλος = eye, cf. Soph. *OC* 704; also see Schmitt [*op. cit.* p. 15] pp. 167 ff. on Κύκλωψ).

Soph. *El.* 1177 ἦ σὸν τὸ κλεινὸν εἶδος Ἠλέκτρας τόδε;

Jebb: "equivalent to κλεινῆς by the common idiom". At first glance this looks like an enallage, but Electra's immediate answer,

τόδ' ἔστ' ἐκεῖνο, καὶ μάλ' ἀθλίως ἔχον,

and Orestes' words at line 1181,

ὦ σῶμ' ἀτίμως κἀθέως ἐφθαρμένον,

make it clear that her εἶδος is itself the subject of discussion. Reading line 1177 instead of hearing it spoken and seeing a suitably attired actor deceives us (cf. Long, p. 103).

Soph. *OT* 869 lyr. θνατὰ φύσις ἀνέρων

Bruhn includes this in his first category. Kamerbeek, who calls the phrase "an emphatic periphrasis of 'mortal man'", apparently sees no enallage here. Bruhn is probably right: θνητός is strongly associated with ἄνδρες. Indeed it is often used substantivally to mean "mortal men".

Aesch. *Pers.* 428 κελαινῆς νυκτὸς ὄμμ(α)

Soph. *Ant.* 879-80 lyr. . . . τόδε λαμπάδος ἱερὸν ὄμμα

Eur. *IT* 110 νυκτὸς ὄμμα λυγαίας

Eur. *Phoen.* 543 νυκτὸς ἀφεγγὲς βλέφαρον

Alexis fr. 89 νυκτὸς ὄμμα τῆς μελαμπέπλου

As often, it is impossible to prove that in these expressions it was more logical or more in accord with the conventions of Greek to make the adjective agree with the genitive. But the passage from Alexis makes it very likely that this was the case. Also, the one example from a lyric passage has the adjective in agreement with the governing substantive.

Soph. *Trach.* 507-9 lyr. ὁ μὲν ἦν ποταμοῦ σθένος, ὑψίκερω
τετράορον
φάσμα ταύρου

τετραόρου codd. Eustathius 1316.6; 1734.10; τετράορον Eustath. 573.27

Soph. *Trach.* 527 lyr. τὸ δ' ἀμφινείκητον ὄμμα νύμφας

Of the first Matthiä, who read τετράορον, writes: "statt ταῦρος τετράορος". For the second, Jebb gives his usual formula for enallage: "Since the words ὄμμα νύμφας form one notion, the adjective is in the nominative". A. A. Long (p. 102) is right in remarking that "Sophocles isolates the beauty of Deianeira by saying 'the maiden's face waits', just as he calls attention to the appearance of Achelous by φάσμα ταύρου". The question is whether the use of periphrasis to isolate an element can coexist with enallage; I believe it can. Because enallage gives the adjective a double allegiance, the figure acts as a bridge between the prosaic expression and the oblique expression. This is especially important if the periphrasis is fairly unusual, as in the second passage. Since ἀμφινείκητον is understood with νύμφας, one is given reason to reconsider the subordination of the prosaic subject of the sentence, νύμφα, to ὄμμα. It is the virtue of enallage that it is able to clarify indirection without diminishing its poetic strength (cf. p. 3).

Lobeck categorizes as enallage a number of prose passages which seem to be periphrases of persons. Those of his examples constructed with the article, τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πράγματα πολεμήσαντα διεφθάρη (Thuc. 1.110.1) and τὰ Ἰσαύρων ἐν λαθραίαις ἦν λῃστείαις οὔπω πρὸς φανερὰν ἐπανάστασιν ἀναστάντα (Zosimus 5.25), are completely unconvincing. The neuter article can be very independent, as in τὸ τῶν Ἑρμῶν (Thuc. 6.60) and τὰ τοῦ Ἀρριβαίου πράσσειν (Thuc. 4.83). τὰ πράγματα is, *a fortiori*, to be taken separately from Ἑλλήνων (cf. E. C. Marchant, *Thucydides I* [London, 1914], who rejects Cobet's πολεμησάντων).

Another group of Lobeck's examples includes various words for aspects of the mind combined with the genitive of words for persons,

e.g. τὸ Αἰτώλων φρόνημα συμπεφευγός (Polybius 4.64) and τὴν τοῦ γυναικείου γένους ἀσθένειαν ... ὀργιζομένην ... φοβουμένην (Dio Cassius frag. CLI, p. 64 T.I. = fr. 49.4 Boissevain). Here too, the governing substantive should be granted the adjective.

One such example is particularly clear: τὰ τῶν δεσποτῶν τε καὶ ἐλευθέρων ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, ἤθη τάχ' ἂν ἀκούσαντα εἰς σύνοιαν ἀφίκοιτ' ἂν τὴν ὀρθήν ... (Pl. *Leg.* 790b; Lobeck gives only an abbreviated quotation). In the first place, it is fatuous to deny Plato, of all writers, the privilege of distinguishing between men and their characters; second, the word order, which emphasizes ἤθη over the words for the men themselves, is against understanding ἀκουσάντων as the "real meaning".

CHAPTER TWO

THE ORIGIN OF ENALLAGE

A long debate has followed Wackernagel's 1908 article "Genetiv und Adjectiv" [1] in which he claimed to demonstrate that the possessive adjective antedated the genitive case of the noun. He had made the elegant observation (p. 143) that "Bei Homer wird bei der periphrastischen Personenbezeichnung durch βίη das Adjectiv nur in Ἡρακλείη, Ἐτεοκληείη, Ἰφικληείη angewandt ... für seine eigen Helden braucht er βίη c[um] Gen[etiv]".

Two recent works, C. Watkin's "Remarks on the Genitive" [2] and D. G. Miller's *Studies in Some Forms of the Genitive Singular in Indo-European,* [3] are pertinent to this study. Miller (p. 12) contends that the argument over chronological priority conceals a mistaken premise: "To say that the genitive is syntactically late is a meaningless statement. The function of a genitive is always present in a language regardless of how it is expressed. There is no natural language that cannot express a genitival relation. Even if all uses of the genitive are transformationally derived, these transformations are still in the structure of every language; *how* they are realized *morphologically* ... and whether they arise or not is another matter". Having made this refinement, Miller asserts: "From all indications the genitive and the relational adjective are identical in semantic content and have a claim to equal antiquity" (p. 15).

Watkins stresses the easy conjunction of possessive adjective and genitive in *Il.* 2.54:

Νεστορέῃ παρὰ νηὶ Πυλοιγενέος βασιλῆος.

Similarly, in a Boeotian inscription,

Γοργινιος (= Γοργινō) ἒμι ὁ κοτυλος καλος κ[αλ]ō,

"a form in apposition to the adjective of belonging ... goes into the genitive"; and Aeolic inscriptions showing a father's name with

---

[1] *Mélanges Saussure* (Paris), pp. 125 ff. = *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen, 1953), vol. II, pp. 1364 ff.

[2] *To Honor Roman Jakobson* (The Hague, 1967) = *Janua Linguarum Series Maior* XXXIII, vol. III, pp. 2194 f.

[3] Unpublished dissertation (Harvard, 1969).

a patronymic adjective add the genitive of the grandfather's name. Watkins regards this as evidence that "both constructions are ... equally firmly anchored in the language", and he states that Old Hittite, Rig-Vedic, and Homeric Greek demonstrate with near certainty that the genitive of belonging "... must go at least as far back in Indo-European syntax as is safe to reconstruct". For the purpose of discovering the origin of enallage it suffices to show the mere coexistence of two morphological realizations of the genitive function in early Greek and to note, with Watkins, that in various dialects the pair could undergo a variety of developments.

Meillet-Vendryes (p. 510) present syntactical evidence for the relationship between the possessive adjective and the genitive of a specific category: "L'adjectif possessif a d'étroits rapports avec le génitif du pronom personnel ... Il admet par exemple un substantif au génitif qui lui est apposé: δαὴρ αὖτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος 'c'était mon beau-frère à moi, femme aux yeux de chienne' (Γ 180), τἀμὰ δυστήνου κακά (Soph. Oed. C. 344), encore dans le N.T. τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου (ad Thess., III, 17) ... C'est par un génitif qu'il faut traduire *tuum ūnum uerbum* 'un seul mot de toi' (Pl. Trin. 388), *noctem tuam* 'une de tes nuits' (Asin. 624; cf. *noctem hùius* 'une nuit de cette femme' ib. 736)".[1]

From Schwyzer (p. 177) we add:

Il. 17.226 ὑμέτερον δὲ ἑκάστου θυμὸν ἀέξω

Plat. *Lach.* 179a παππῷον ὄνομ' ἔχει τοὐμοῦ πατρός

Soph. *Trach.* 755 τὸ σὸν μόνης δώρημα

Ar. *Ach.* 93 τόν γε σὸν [ὀφθαλμόν] τοῦ πρέσβεως

Cf. also the strengthening of the possessive by the addition of αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς, αὐτῶν (Schwyzer, p. 205).

Finally, Pindar makes striking poetry by bracketing a genitive within a possessive adjective and the noun it qualifies:

Nem. 8.2 [Ὧρα] παρθενηίοις παίδων τ' ἐφίζοισα γλεφάροις

The coexistence in early Greek of the possessive adjective and the genitive case of a substantive played by far the most important role in the history of enallage. We can, indeed, identify a more specific locus of diffusion, the juxtaposition of the possessive pronominal and the genitive.

[1] The *New Testament* citation probably does not belong in this group: see Appendix C.

It has long been recognized that enallage with the pronominal possessive is very frequent:

Pind. *Ol.* 8.42 τεαῖς . . . χερὸς ἐργασίαις

Pind. *Ol.* 12.13 τεά . . . τιμὰ . . . ποδῶν

Pind. *Pyth.* 4.255 ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου

Soph. *El.* 785-6 τοὐμὸν . . . ψυχῆς αἷμα

Soph. *El.* 1390 lyr. τοὐμὸν φρενῶν ὄνειρον

Soph. *OT* 1032 ποδῶν . . . ἄρθρα . . . τὰ σά

Soph. *OT* 1400-1 τοὐμὸν αἷμα . . . πατρός

Eur. *Andr.* 584 οὑμὸς . . . παῖς παιδός

Eur. *Andr.* 1063 σῷ . . . παιδὸς παιδί
σῷ Lobeck σοῦ codd.

Eur. *Bacch.* 1327-8 σός . . . παῖς παιδός

Eur. *HF* 468 τἀμὰ πεδία γῆς

Eur. *HF* 876 lyr. σὸν ἄνθος πόλεος

Eur. *Hipp.* 335 σέβας . . . χειρὸς . . . τὸ σόν

Eur. *Ion* 281 χάσμα σὸν . . . χθονός

Eur. *Ion* 1337 χερὸς ὑπ' ἀγκάλαις ἐμαῖς
χερὸς ὑπαγκάλισμ' ἐμῆς Elmsley

Eur. *IA* 394 μωρίᾳ τῇ σῇ φρενῶν
σῇ . . . μωρίᾳ φρενῶν Markland οἶμαι δ' εἴσῃ codd.

Eur. *IA* 784 lyr. ἐμοῖσι τέκνων τέκνοις

Eur. *Phoen.* 30-1 τὸν ἐμὸν ὠδίνων πόνον

Eur. *Supp.* 631 lyr. τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἵδρυμα πόλεος

Thuc. 2.61.2 ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἀσθενεῖ τῆς γνώμης

Ath. IX 379 C τὴν ὑμετέραν τῶν αἰσθητηρίων κρίσιν

Anth. Pal. 7.324.3 δι' ἐμὴν βιότοιο τελευτήν

Melinno apud Stobaeum 12.11 (Hense-Wachsmuth) σᾷ δ' ὑπὰ σδεύγλᾳ . . . λεπάδνων

This type has an ancestor, widely recognized as enallage, in Homer:

Od. 14.197 οὔ τι διαπρήξαιμι λέγων ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ

(Two other expressions, neither plausible as enallage, are discussed on p. 43; cf. also pp. 15 ff.).

Is this an instance of enallage? Because this is Homer, the question is, in a way, meaningless: no historical argument can be based on the line unless we specify the persons to whom the adjective ἐμά did or did not seem transferred from θυμοῦ. I will argue that an oral composer, i.e. a man who extemporized verses from the Homeric formula structure, would not notice, and *a fortiori* could not have intended, any illogical concord of adjective and noun, nor even a compound expression like Kühner-Gerth's translation "Herzensleid". A later poet, say Pindar or Aeschylus, would judge the grammar anomalous in terms of their contemporary natural language (as would a scribe—thus the *varia lectio* θυμῷ).

The argument is circumscribed in several ways. We are considering a poet for whom the technique of oral composition is still alive. We need not know how the phrase was regarded by the specific man or men who put ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ exactly where we find it in the *Odyssey*. Further, it is sufficient to demonstrate that poets of the early fifth-century considered the phrase strange in the context of early fifth-century speech; whether they considered it normal or abnormal *for Homer* is not crucial, since any form of strangeness would be a candidate for incorporation into their own poetry regardless of its frequency as a preserved archaic feature. Finally, the argument dwells on a certain reading of a certain line, but only to show how a *type* of construction in early poetry would be reinterpreted by later writers.

The collocation ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ occurs only once in the extant Homeric corpus and it might be argued that its very uniqueness indicates experimentation with unusual, innovative syntax. But there is much in Homer than mitigates the apparent strangeness. Flexibility of expression, easily demonstrable for the meaning of ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ, precludes grave syntactical uncertainty plotted by the oral poet or aroused in the mind of his contemporary audience. At the most, the construction might have been sensed as ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, but even this is unlikely.

ἐμὰ κήδεα would give no trouble: κήδεα + possessive adjective is found at *Od.* 9.12

σοὶ δ' ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμὸς ἐπετράπετο στονόεντα

and at *Od.* 11.376

τλαίης ἐν μεγάρῳ τὰ σὰ κήδεα μυθήσασθαι.

Would there be any strong compulsion to connect ἐμά with θυμοῦ?

Meter prevents ἐμοῦ κήδεα θυμοῦ, but it is true that θυμός is found with a possessive adjective, as in *Il.* 18.53

εἴδετ' ἀκούουσαι ὅσ' ἐμῷ ἔνι κήδεα θυμῷ,

Il. 23.611

ὡς ἐμὸς οὔ ποτε θυμὸς ὑπερφίαλος καὶ ἀπηνής,

and *Od.* 2.138

ὑμέτερος δ' εἰ μὲν θυμὸς νεμεσίζεται αὐτῶν.

Il. 11.403 contains a common formula:

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν

and in the formula θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν (*Il.* 4.313 and *passim*) that which holds the θυμός gets a possessive. On the other hand, a possessive adjective, or other form denoting possession, was not obligatory: we have

Il. 18.8 μὴ δή μοι τελέωσι θεοὶ κακὰ κήδεα θυμῷ,

Od. 8.149 ἀλλ' ἄγε πείρησαι, σκέδασον δ' ἀπὸ κήδεα θυμοῦ,

and *Od.* 9.12 (quoted above), picking out just collocations of κήδεα and θυμός. Also, in many of its meanings θυμός does not naturally attract a possessive. There is, then, freedom to attach the notion of possession to θυμός, directly or indirectly, or to leave it out.

There is no reason to regard κήδεα θυμοῦ as a collocation so common that it would approximate a compound. Its only other occurrence is at *Od.* 8.149 (quoted above), and there the genitive is probably governed by ἀπό (that is, ἀπό is probably a preposition, not an adverb). κήδεα θυμοῦ occurs twice, at *Il.* 18.8 and 53 (both given above). It would be more natural to follow the order and consider ἐμὰ κήδεα an *ad hoc* pair. If so, the genitive would need no special name, not even "possessive": "*Génitif adnominal.* Comme complément de nom, le génitif exprime ce qui est de la sphère du nom, ce qui appartient au nom et le complète. Aussi peut-on observer entre le génitif et le nom dont il dépend tous les rapports de sens possibles" (Meillet-Vendryes, p. 561). Palmer [1] speaks of the "essential unity of the genitive in denoting the sphere, milieu, or environment in which a noun is placed or a verbal action takes place". Thus we might say, if we had no other recourse, that the θυμός was the milieu of Odysseus' κήδεα.

---

[1] "The Language of Homer", in *A Companion to Homer*, eds. A. Wace and F. H. Stubbings (London, 1963), pp. 133 f.

But grammatical contortions, especially in matters of word order effecting concord, are alien to the λέξις εἰρομένη. This is not the world of *Quis multa gracilis*. A simpler solution is available. We have already seen that the possessive adjective has an intimate relation with the genitive. κήδεα was used with the genitive of a proper noun,

Od. 5.261 τοῖσι δ' Ἀθηναίη λέγε κήδεα πόλλ' Ὀδυσῆος,

with the genitive of σύ strengthened by αὐτοῦ,

Od. 11.369 πάντων Ἀργείων σέο τ' αὐτοῦ κήδεα λυγρά,

similarly with the third person pronoun,

Il. 19.302 Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν αὐτῶν κήδε' ἑκάστη,

and at least once we find possessive adjective together with the genitive of a pronoun,

Od. 14.185 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι σύ ... τὰ σ' αὐτοῦ κήδε' ἐνίσπες.

(This is, of course, only twelve lines distant from the expression in question, which may be significant).

Judged in the context of Homeric composition ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ is unremarkable; or, more precisely, it was unremarkable to those Greeks whose natural language preserved the bond of possessive adjective and genitive as a regular feature. At some stage, perhaps before the composition of the *Odyssey* as transmitted to us, only bards still expert in the technique of oral composition and the archaic syntax it preserves would find the phrase ordinary; amateur performers and laymen would be puzzled. Still later, all Greek speakers would find it eccentric, even in Homeric syntax. We cannot assign these stages even the roughest of dates, but the sequence seems certain.

This type of enallage is probably the oldest; at least there is no older form. Viewed from the fifth century, the pedigree extends as far back as Homer. But even if we did not have the evidence of *Odyssey* 14.197, the relative antiquity of the type could be inferred with some certainty: one expects the least "bold", most colorless expression to antedate more baroque constructions. (The dullness of the pronominal possessive enallage is rivaled by few others: Aesch. *PV* 112 τοιάσδε ποινὰς ἀμπλακημάτων τίνω comes to mind.) And one expects that a familiar form is more appropriate to dialogue sections of tragedy and to prose than an elegant variation would be.[1]

[1] On prose enallage see Appendix E; distribution among the various meters of tragedy is discussed on pp. 49 f.

Headlam asserts, without offering any evidence for his view, that "Transference of epithets [virtually all his examples are enallages] was in its origin a metrical device for dealing conveniently with proper names, especially geographical". The proper name enallage does indeed have a long history, but I doubt very much that it is the original type.

As noted in the definition which opens this study, *Il.* 2.54 is not an enallage. Neither is *Il.* 5.741

ἐν δέ τε Γοργείη κεφαλὴ δεινοῖο πελώρου,

unless, *per impossibile,* we read γοργείη and make it equal the non-possessive γοργῆς which ordinarily would modify πελώρου rather than κεφαλή. Since the syntax of both these expressions is different from that of the true enallage, they are less likely a locus of diffusion than ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ. It must be conceded, however, that it may be purely accidental that we do not have e.g. Ὀλύμπια θαύματα τέχνης (Nonnus *Dion.* 25.385) attested in Homer. Such an expression meets the formal specifications of enallage.

Of course the adjectives in many enallages are not possessive. If my theory on the origin of enallage is correct, the non-possessive type arose directly by an analogical imitation of the syntactical form, indirectly through an intermediate type employing an adjective whose meaning was both possessive and descriptive, or by a combination of these two developments. All of these possibilities are equally plausible.

I have found no enallages in religious inscriptions and virtually none in literature before the fifth century. But this is certainly not a fatal objection. Because our evidence is so scanty, we cannot insist that an archaism used by poets and writers of artistic prose be attested independently of the literary tradition. [1]

---

[1] Cf. E. Fraenkel's discussion (*Horace* [Oxford, 1957], pp. 170 f.) of *cumque* in *C.* 1.32.

CHAPTER THREE

EVIDENCE FOR ENALLAGE AS ARCHAISM

Correlation with a Morphological Archaism

In the last chapter it was maintained that the principal origin of enallage is the coexistence of possessive adjective and genitive in the early stages of the language. In this chapter I attempt to prove that enallage is an archaism, whether or not my specific conjecture is correct.

In his study *Die griechischen Adjective zweier Endungen auf* -ΟΣ Kastner deals with those simplex *o*-stem adjectives which show the old bipartite inflection (masculine and feminine sharing a declension opposed to the neuter, i.e. -ος/-ον instead of the new arrangement -ος/-η/-ον). As is true of enallage, there is no single explanation which covers all instances. Kastner shows, for example, that placement in a hexameter line, the inheritance of a feature in -υ-, -Ϝεντ-, and -ιο adjectives, and the contemporaneous use of an adjective ending in -ιος and a collective in -α all bear on the phenomenon.

What is especially significant for the present study is Kastner's discovery that this morphological archaism is found with great frequency in certain semantic fields, or "Wortfelder". To a remarkable degree, enallage is heavily concentrated in many of these semantic fields. (Though not in all of them: the festival "Wortfeld" yields the greatest number of instances of Kastner's phenomenon, but only one possible enallage.) Most impressive is the frequency of enallage in family contexts, which is separately treated on pp. 35 ff. This correlation provides strong evidence that enallage is, above all, a preservation of archaic syntax. At the very least we can claim that it is most improbable that syntactic innovation would be placed in contexts where numerous archaisms of diction, phonology, and morphology are found (cf. Kastner, p. 114, n. 1).

There follows a list of enallages found in Kastner's "wichtigsten Wortfelder" (pp. 131 f.). For each field I give first the nouns which Kastner finds qualified by simplex two-termination -*o* stem adjectives and then the examples of enallage, including some examples

in which the word, though not in the enallage itself, stands very close to or within the figure. There is considerable overlapping of categories. "*" marks phrases which include a word (or compound of a word) specifically included in the field; "?" before an entry indicates that the example is dubious, either because its membership in the field is uncertain or because its status as enallage is questionable. The reader is referred to the *Index Locorum* for further discussion of individual passages.

1. *Religion*

a. General

ἁγιστεία, ἀθανασία, ἐπιφανεία, εὐορκία, οἴκησις (= grave), ὁσία, σωτηρία

Aesch. *Eum.* 326-7 lyr. ματρῷον ἄγνισμα ... φόνου

?Aesch. *Sept.* 1008 θάπτειν ... γῆς φίλαις κατασκαφαῖς

?Soph. *OT* 832-3 τοιάνδ' ... κηλῖδ' ... συμφορᾶς

Eur. *Ion* 281 πατέρα ... χάσμα σὸν ... χθονός

Lycoph. 831-2 τὸν ... Γαύαντος τάφον ... μουσόφθαρτον

Contexts of death and keening, which are to be connected with religion, frequently show enallage:

Aesch. *Cho.* 30-31 lyr. στολμοὶ πέπλων ... πεπληγμένοι

Soph. *Ant.* 26 τὸν ... θανόντα Πολυνείκους νέκυν

Eur. *Andr.* 1003 πατρὸς φόνιον δίκην

Eur. *Andr.* 1063 σῷ ... παιδὸς παιδὶ πορσύνων μόρον

σῷ Lobeck σοῦ codd.

Eur. *Alc.* 103-4 lyr. νεολαία / δουπεῖ χεὶρ γυναικῶν

Eur. *Phoen.* 1351 lyr. λευκοπῆχεις κτύπους χεροῖν

Eur. *Phoen.* 1635 τριπτύχους θρήνους νεκρῶν

τριπτύχων νεκρῶν γόους γρ. M γρ. B
θρήνους] τύπους

Eur. *Tro.* 564-5 lyr. καράτομος ἐρημία / νεανίδων

?Thuc. 1.8.1 σκευῇ τῶν ὅπλων ξυντεθαμμένῃ

Anth. Pal. 7.334.3 ἐμὴν βιότοιο τελευτήν

b. Sacrifice

ἀπαρχή, θυηλή, θυσία, λοιβή, προχύτη, σπονδή, σφαγή, χέρνιψ, χοή

Theoc. *Id.* 17.126 πιανθέντα βοῶν ὄγε μηρία

c. Hearth

?Pind. *Nem.* 7.93-4 τετραόροισιν . . . ἁρμάτων ζυγοῖς ἐν τεμένεσσι

Pind. *Ol.* 10.24-5 ἀγῶνα . . . βωμῶν ἑξάριθμον

Aesch. *Supp.* 482 βωμοὺς ἐπ' ἄλλους δαιμόνων

*Soph. *Aj.* 860 πατρῷον ἑστίας βάθρον

Soph. *El.* 1374-5 πατρῷα ἕδη θεῶν

Soph. *Trach.* 993 Κηναία κρηπὶς βωμῶν

*Eur. *Alc.* 538 ξένων πρὸς ἄλλην ἑστίαν

ἄλλων V B ἄλλην L P

d. Festival

ἀναβολή, ἔνοσις, ἑορτή, εὐφροσύνη, ἠχώ, θεωρία, μολπή, πανήγυρις, πομπή, τελετή, χορεία, ᾠδή

?*Aesch. *Pers.* 58 δειναῖς βασιλέως ὑπὸ πομπαῖς

e. Prayer, curse

ἀρά, εὐχή, κατάρα, λιτή

?*Aesch. *Sept.* 724-5 lyr. περιθύμους κατάρας Οἰδιπόδα

*Aesch. *Sept.* 171-2 lyr. παρθένων χειροτόνους λιτάς

f. Oracle, omen

ἀστραπή, βολή, βροντή, ἐνοπή, ἐφετμή, λαμπάς

*Soph. *Ant.* 879-80 lyr. τόδε λαμπάδος ἱερὸν ὄμμα

(With the exception of Aesch. *Ag.* 286, all of Kastner's citations show λαμπάς meaning "lightning". Here it refers to the sun.)

*Soph. fr. 538 κεραυνία πέμφιξ βροντῆς

(Pearson: "Dobree points out [that this] . . . is a case of hypallage".)

Ar. *Plut.* 45-6 . . . τὴν ἐπίνοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ φράζουσαν

2. *State and Law*

ἀγορά, ἀρχή, βασιλεία, εἰρήνη, ἐκεχειρία, ἐκκλησία, δίκη, ἡμέρα, παραδοχή, πολιτεία, πρᾶξις, προξενία, τιμή

?Aesch. *Ag.* 312-3 τοιοίδε . . . λαμπαδηφόρων νομοί,
ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι

Aesch. *PV* 112 τοιάσδε ποινὰς ἀμπλακημάτων

(Kühner-Gerth: "= τοιῶνδε ἀμπ[λακημάτων]; Stanley conjectured τοιῶνδε.)

*Soph. *OT* 161 lyr. κυκλόεντ' ἀγορᾶς θρόνον

(Jebb: "= κυκλοέσσης ἀγορᾶς θρόνον ... 'Round throne of the marketplace' ". Since this is addressed to Artemis, it might more properly be placed in the first category.)

Soph. *OT* 832-3 τοιάνδ' ... κηλῖδ' ... συμφορᾶς

(For συμφορά = "crime", "guilt", see Jebb ad *OT* 99.)

Soph. *OT* 1032 ποδῶν ἂν ἄρθρα μαρτυρήσειεν τὰ σά

*Eur. *Andr.* 1003 πατρὸς φόνιον δίκην

*Eur. *Bacch.* 1327-8 σὸς δ' ἔχει δίκην παῖς παιδός

Thuc. 2.61.2 ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἀσθενεῖ τῆς γνώμης

(γνώμη here means "intelligence" [and/or will: see Gomme ad loc.]. I place the phrase here on the ground of γνώμη's frequent meaning of "judgement", "opinion", often in political contexts: cf. 3.38.1 ὁ αὐτός εἰμι τῇ γνώμῃ.)

Athen. IX 379 C ἄνδρες δικασταί (δικαστὰς γὰρ ὑμᾶς οὐκ ὀκνήσαιμ' ἂν καλεῖν ἀναμένων τὴν ὑμετέραν τῶν αἰσθητηρίων κρίσιν)

3. *Descent*

βλάστη, γενεά, γένεσις, γέννα, γονή, εὐγένεια, φύσις

(I list here only the unique example of an enallage which includes a word given by Kastner; for the numerous enallages in family contexts see pp. 35 ff.)

*Soph. *OT* 869 lyr. θνατὰ φύσις ἀνέρων

4. *Voice, call*

ἁρμονία, βάξις, βοή, γλῶττα, ἐνοπή, ἠχώ, κλαγή, κληδών, μολπή, οἰμωγή, ὀπωπή, ὄψ, στεναχή, φάτις, φήμη, φωνή

Aesch. *Sept.* 348-50 lyr. βλαχαὶ δ' αἱματόεσσαι
τῶν ἐπιμαστιδίων
ἀρτιτρεφεῖς βρέμονται

Aesch. fr. 158.3-4 μυκηθμοῖσι καὶ βρυχήμασιν
ἕρπουσι μήλων

*Soph. *Aj.* 892 τίνος βοὴ πάραυλος ... νάπους

Eur. *Cyc.* 58-9 lyr. ἀμερόκοιτοι βλαχαὶ τεκέων

Eur. *HF* 883-4 lyr. ἑκατογκεφάλοις ὄφεων ἰαχήμασι
ἑκατὸν κεφαλαῖς L P corr. Reiske

Ar. *Av.* 1198 δίνης πτερωτὸς φθόγγος

5. *Knowledge, invention*

ἀμαθία, ἀμηχανία, ἐμπειρία, μηχανή, παλάμη, φροντίς

(No examples of enallage)

6. *Joy, pain*

ἐλπίς, ἐπιθυμία, ἡδονή, λύπη, ὀργή, πάθη, πημονή, χαρά, ὠδίς

Hom. *Od.* 14.197 ἐμὰ κήδεα θυμοῦ

Aesch. *Ag.* 50 anap. ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων

Aesch. *Cho.* 1070 anap. ἀνδρὸς βασίλεια πάθη

*Eur. *Bacch.* 866-7 lyr. χλοεραῖς λείμακος ἡδοναῖς

Trag. Adesp. 110.1-2 πῆμ' ἐλευθέραν δάκνον ψυχὴν ἀνδρός

7. *Friendship, hatred*

ἔχθρα, τιμωρία, φιλία, χάρις, ὕβρις

(No examples of enallage, unless we include Pind. *Pyth.* 10.36 ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων, where the meaning given ὕβρις is not right for this category.)

8. *Luck, misfortune*

ἄτη, δύη, συμφορά, τύχη

*Soph. *Ant.* 862-3 lyr. ματρῷαι λέκτρων ἆται

9. *Conflict, force, plundering*

ἀλκή, ἅμιλλα, ἀρή, ἁρπαγή, βία, βλάβη, ἔρις, κλοπή, μάχη, ὁρμή, στρατεία, φυγή

Pind. *Pyth.* 8.37 Κλειτομάχοιο νίκαν θρασύγυιον

Soph. *Ant.* 793-4 lyr. νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον

*Soph. *El.* 492-3 lyr. ἄλεκτρ' ἄνυμφα γάμων ἁμιλλήμαθ'

Soph. *El.* 681-2 κλεινὸν Ἑλλάδος πρόσχημ' ἀγῶνος

Soph. *Trach.* 527 lyr. ἀμφινείκητον ὄμμα νύμφας

*Eur. *Hipp.* 1140-1 lyr. νυμφιδία λέκτρων ἅμιλλα

*Eur. *IA* 1266 λέκτρων ἁρπαγὰς Ἑλληνικῶν

Ἑλληνικῶν Elmsley ἑλληνικάς L P

10. *Local designations*

αὐλή, θύρα, παστάς, πύλη, στέγη, στήλη, στοά

Hes. fr. 33a.20 M-W Νηλῆος ἀγακλειτοῦ τεῖχος

ἀγακλειτοῦ West ἀγακλειτὸν Π

Pind. *Isth.* 8.3 πατρὸς ἀγλαὸν πρόθυρον

Pind. *Ol.* 1.42 ὕπατον εὐρυτίμου δῶμα Διός

*Eur. *Alc.* 23 μελάθρων τῶνδε φιλτάτην στέγην

τῶνδε φιλτάτην Σ *Hipp.* 1437 τήνδε φιλτάτην L P τῶδε φιλτάτων V B

11. *Geographical designations*

ἀκτή, ἄρουρα, γῆ, κορυφή, πέτρα, πλάξ, πόλις, ὕλη, χθών, χοιράς, χώρα

(Kastner includes πόλις in this category, but it might more properly be placed in the second, except when it means "citadel": cf. Thuc. 7.77.7 ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τείχη; Eur. *Bacch.* 58.)

Pind. *Nem.* 6.44 Φλειοῦντος ὑπ' ὠγυγίοις ὄρεσιν

?Pind. *Pyth.* 4.15 ἀστέων ῥίζαν μελησίμβροτον

Pind. *Pyth.* 9.83 λευκίπποισι Καδμείων ἀγυιαῖς

*Aesch. *Ag.* 503 ἰὼ πατρῷον οὖδας Ἀργείας χθονός

*Aesch. *Eum.* 292 χώρας ἐν τόποις Λιβυστικοῖς

*Aesch. *Eum.* 457 Τροίαν ἄπολιν Ἰλίου πόλιν

* ?Aesch. *Sept.* 304-5 lyr. ποῖον γαίας πέδον τᾶσδ' ἄρειον

Aesch. *Pers.* 250 ὦ Περσὶς αἶα καὶ πολὺς πλούτου λιμήν

Aesch. fr. 158.3-4 . . . μυκηθμοῖσι καὶ βρυχήμασιν
ἕρπουσι μήλων πᾶν ὀρεχθεύει πέδον

*Soph. *OC* 297 πατρῷον ἄστυ γᾶς

*Soph. *Phil.* 952 σχῆμα πέτρας δίπυλον

*Eur. *El.* 1 Ὦ γῆς παλαιὸν ἄργος

*Eur. *HF* 468 τἀμὰ πεδία γῆς

*Eur. *HF* 876 lyr. σὸν ἄνθος πόλεος

*Eur. *Ion* 281 χάσμα σὸν χθονός

*Eur. *Supp.* 631 lyr. τὸ σὸν ἄγαλμα, τὸ σὸν ἵδρυμα πόλεος

*Cratin. 220 Βοιώτιον οὖθαρ ἀρούρης

Ap. Rhod. 4.1780 Ὀπούντιά τ' ἄστεα Λοκρῶν

*Mellino apud Stobaeum 12.11-12 Hense-Wachsmuth
σᾷ δ' ὑπὰ σδεύγλᾳ κρατερῶν λεπάδνων
στέρνα γαίας

*Nonn. *D.* 44.1 Δαυλάντιον ἔθνος ἀρούρης

Nonn. *D.* 43.311 Θρήισσαν ὑπὸ σπήλυγγα Καβείρων

*Nonn. *D.* 48.241 παρὰ σφυρὰ Δίνδυμα πέτρης

12. *Water*

ἅλμη, θάλαττα, κρήνη, κώπη, πηγή, πλάτη, ῥανίς, ῥοή, σταγμών

**Hym. Hom. Cer.* 15 ἁλμυρὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης [1]

*Simon. 111.43B Σκιρωνικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης

*Pind. *Isthm.* 7.19 κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν

Pind. *Nem.* 3.59 θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι

Pind. *Ol.* 1.48 ὕδατος ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν

*Aesch. *Ag.* 1509 lyr. ὁμοσπόροις ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἱμάτων

Aesch. *PV* 89-90 κυμάτων ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα

Aesch. *Sept.* 64 κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ

Aesch. *Sept.* 1076-7 anap. ἀλλοδάπῳ κύματι φωτῶν

Soph. *Aj.* 249 lyr. θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγὸν

Soph. *Trach.* 656 πολύκωπον ὄχημα ναός

Eur. *Hel.* 400 οἶδμα πόντιον ἁλός

Eur. *HF* 410-11 Ἄξεινον οἶδμα λίμνας

*Eur. *HF* 450 γραίας ὄσσων πηγάς

Eur. *Med.* 211-12 lyr. Πόντου κλῇδ' ἀπέραντον

Eur. *Tro.* 1-2 Αἴγαιον ἁλμυρὸν βάθος πόντου

Ion Trag. 60 πόντου πεδίον Αἰγαῖον

*Ar. *Av.* 250 πόντιον οἶδμα θαλάσσης

*Mellinno apud Stobaeum 12.11-12 Hense-Wachsmuth

σᾷ δ' ὑπὰ σδεύγλᾳ κρατερῶν λεπάδνων

. . . πολιᾶς θαλάσσας

BMus. Inscr. 1012.5 κατ' Αἰγαίην πόντου πλάκα

D.P. 37 Ἰνδικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης

*Nonn. *D.* 43.225 Ἴσθμιον οἶδμα Παλληνίδος ἅλμης

13. *Breath, smell*

ἀήτη, αὐτμή, ὀδμή

Soph. *Aj.* 7-8 κυνὸς εὔρινος βάσις

*Eur. *Hipp.* 1391 ὦ θεῖον ὀδμῆς πνεῦμα

[1] Nature smiles, laughs, or sparkles merrily in this passage, as she does in Aesch. *PV* 89-90 below. These enallages could, therefore, also be placed in the sixth category. Further, this motif appears in the Rig-Veda and may be inherited from Proto-Indo-European poetry (see West ad *Theog.* 40).

My argument would suffer great embarrassment if distinct feminine forms appeared in enallages constructed with simplex -ος adjectives elsewhere in the same author or his contemporaries well attested with two terminations. There is, in fact, little clear-cut evidence of such a contradiction:

Pind. *Isth.* 7.19 κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν

κλυτός is of two terminations only in Homer and Hesiod. Further, Kastner concludes: "Bei den Verbaladjectiven auf -τος stehen die unmotivierten [i.e. without a distinct feminine form] Simplicia unter dem Einfluss der in Regel motionlosen und genetisch wohl ältern Komposita" (p. 112).

Soph. *OT* 869 lyr. θνατὰ φύσις ἀνέρων

θνητός, θνητή, θνητόν is the usual arrangement. θνητός with two terminations is strictly Euripidean (see Kastner, p. 47). Also, φύσις was used to form periphrases (Kühner-Gerth, p. 281; LSJ s.v. II.b.5); Kastner (p. 55) notes that the sole Attic example of βασίλειος with three endings occurs in a borrowing of the epic "Typus βίη Ἡρακλείη", and perhaps φύσις ἀνέρων is analogous.[1]

Eur. *Hipp.* 1140-1 lyr. νυμφιδία λέκτρων ἅμιλλα

Aside from this passage there is only one other possible attestation of νυμφίδιος or νυμφεῖος with two endings, viz. at Eur. *Alc.* 855 (where Dale prefers the two termination form, but cf. Kastner, p. 78).

Soph. *Phil.* 1123-4 lyr. πολιᾶς πόντου θινός

πολιός has three endings everywhere but Homer and Eur. *Andr.* 348. In the latter passage a distinct feminine form might have been avoided in order to stress sexlessness.

Pind. *Pyth.* 4.196 φιλίαν νόστοιο μοῖραν

Aesch. *Sept.* 1008 γῆς φίλαις κατασκαφαῖς

These are both particularly dubious as enallage. Also, φίλιος has two terminations only in lyric sections of drama: see Kastner, p. 97.

Enallage in Family Contexts

Enallage occurs very often with words denoting family relationships. It is of course true that Pindar took the common descent which bound the victor to his relatives, actual and mythical, as a central

[1] Cf. p. 18.

theme, and that conflict within a family was a principal topic in tragic drama. But subject matter alone gives only a partial explanation of the phenomenon.

The primitive notion (not peculiar to the Greeks, of course) that the blood of parents and their children is literally the same permits, or perhaps even invites, an enallage in which the adjective can be understood with its grammatical referent as well as with the genitive:

Soph. *OT* 1400-1 ...τοὐμὸν αἷμα τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν ἄπο
ἐπίετε πατρός.

Jebb explains: "τοὐμὸν αἷμα, thus divided from πατρός is more than αἷμα τοὐμοῦ πατρός:[1] 'the same blood which flows in my own veins—the blood of my father' ". Kamerbeek, revealing his bias against the figure, declares that this is "much more, of course, than a meaningless hypallage [i.e. enallage]". In my view, this Sophoclean usage is not especially more meaningful than others of the type, but simply more transparent. The biological theory which lies behind it and the profound emotion it expresses appear many times.

Aeschylus constructs "a striking example of the 'transferred' epithet" (Page) at *Ag.* 1509-10 lyr.: [2]

ὁμοσπόροις / ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἱμάτων

In another passage from Sophocles the blood belongs to the speaker's own ψυχή:

El. 784-6 ἥδε γὰρ μείζων βλάβη
ξύνοικος ἦν μοι, τοὐμὸν ἐκπίνουσ' ἀεὶ
ψυχῆς ἄκρατον αἷμα.

But since τοὐμὸν αἷμα can be understood of kin (LSJ s.v. αἷμα III) there is a chilling nuance: Clytemnestra's blood is the same as Electra's, even though her ψυχή is strictly her own. The ambiguous syntax hints at the unnatural emotion. Formulae like Schneidewin's "im Sinne von αἷμα ἐμῆς ψυχῆς" miss the irony.

Perhaps the most famous enallage in Greek is formed with an adjective meaning "of common blood":

Soph. *Ant.* 793-4 σὺ καὶ τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν
ξύναιμον ἔχεις ταράξας.

---

[1] Jebb seems to assume that the three words must be adjacent to be regarded as enallage.

[2] For Aeschylus, killing a blood relative is like suicide: ἀνδροῖν δ' ὁμαίμοιν θάνατος ὧδ' αὐτοκτόνος (*Sept.* 681).

Cf. pp. 1 f. The echo from vv. 658-9,

πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐφυμνείτω Δία
ξύναιμον,

would be muted if ξύναιμον were in the genitive plural. And enallage contributes to a repetition of a compounded form of Haimon's name.

Sophocles also has

Ant. 1164 εὐγενεῖ τέκνων σπορᾷ

and

fr. 799.3 ἀνδρὸς αἷμα συγγενές

(Pearson: "Brunck's συγγενοῦς is unnecessary for ἀνδρὸς αἷμα forms a single notion".)

If Schroeder's conjecture is right, Pindar wrote:

Nem. 6.15-16 ἴχνεσιν ἐν Πραξιδάμαντος ἑὸν πόδα νέμων
πατροπάτορος ὁμαιμίοις
ὁμαιμίου codd.

Sophocles has numerous instances of enallage with πατρῷος and ματρῷος; most are explained as "compound" expressions:

Aj. 860 ὦ πατρῷον ἑστίας βάθρον

(Jebb: "πατρῷον instead of πατρῴας since ἑστίας βάθρον is a single notion".)

El. 1374-5 πατρῷα . . . ἕδη θεῶν

(Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 404 θεῶν πατρῴων ἕδη. Kaibel: "Da ἕδη θεῶν ein Begriff ist, so war πατρῷα oder πατρῴων gleichwertig".)

Trach. 817-8 ὄγκον γὰρ ἄλλως ὀνόματος τί δεῖ τρέφειν
μητρῷον

(Jebb: "The adj[ective] agrees with ὄγκον since ὄγκ[ον] ὀνόματος = 'name-dignity' ".)

OC 297 πατρῷον ἄστυ γᾶς

Cf. p. 10.

Ant. 862-3 lyr. ἰὼ ματρῷαι λέκτρων ἆται

(Bruhn places this in his first category; Jebb, seeing no compound, or at least not indicating so, gives the prosaic "equivalent" with the adjective in the genitive.)

El. 1290 πατρῴαν κτῆσιν Αἴγισθος δόμων

(Jebb: "πατρῴαν properly the epithet of δόμων").

Outside of Sophocles I have found only one example of this type:

Aesch. *Eum.* 326-7 lyr. ματρῷον ἄγνισμα ... φόνου

With this cf. Eur. *Andr.* 1003

πατρὸς φόνιον δίκην,

which Wilamowitz (ad *HF* 468) translates "Busse für den Mord des Vaters".

More important, a line in the *Agamemnon* shows that πατρῷος has unusual grammatical flexibility:

228 lyr. λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληδόνας πατρῴους

The commentators seem uneasy: Fraenkel states that πατρῴους "to some extent [represents] an objective genitive", but Page's remark, "an extraordinary expression for 'her cries of "father" ' ", shows a better understanding. Syntactically, κληδών functions here like ὄνομα, to which a prose writer could add a suitable word in the genitive case, e.g. τὸ μέγα ὄνομα τῶν 'Αθηνῶν (Thuc. 7.64).[1] The point here is that the Aeschylean expression would be easily understood by an audience for whom the adjective πατρῷος had a particularly strong association with the genitive case of the noun.[2]

πατρῷος is widely attested as a cult title of Zeus and Apollo. It is different from other cult titles in that it has a more general meaning than, say, ξένιος; rather than referring to a sphere of human activity watched over by a god or being derived from the name of a supplanted god, the original meaning of πατρῷος says something about the history of the cult, viz. that it "has been transmitted with the household".[3]

The messenger's report of Polyneices' prayer suggests a possible locus of diffusion:

Aesch. *Sept.* 639-40 τοιαῦτ' ἀυτεῖ καὶ θεοὺς γενεθλίους
καλεῖ πατρῴας γῆς ἐποπτῆρας λιτῶν.

γενέθλιος is virtually synonymous with πατρῷος: "Da das Grundwort γενέθλη seit Homer 'Geschlecht, Familie' heisst, besteht in

---

[1] If a word like κληδών or ὄνομα is not included, the genitive case enjoys no special priority; the name called out is simply inflected to fit the grammar of the sentence (Groeneboom ad *Ag.* 47-54).

[2] Ovid probably had this passage in mind when he wrote *oraque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen / excipiuntur aqua, quae nomen traxit ab illo* (Met. 8. 229-30).

[3] K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes' Clouds* (Oxford, 1968), p. 264. Its later implication was "from whom the community is descended".

semantischer Hinsicht auch eine enge Beziehung zu πάτριος. So sind die θεοὶ γενέθλιοι (A. *Th.* 639) und die θεοὶ πάτριοι (Hdt. 1.172) praktisch identisch". (Kastner, p. 77). It seems highly probable (1) that some more concise prayer formulae omitted the adjective for γῆ and retained it for θεοί and (2) that occasionally some noun less often called πατρῷος got the adjective, as in πατρῷον ἄστυ γᾶς (Soph. *OT* 296: whether this particular utterance is an old formula preserved *verbatim* or a newly created enallage is unimportant for the argument). Once the coexistence of possessive adjective and genitive had been lost in the natural language, one would have felt some syntactic uncertainty in the first type and a downright misattribution in the second.

Dover (*loc. cit.*, p. 38, n. 3) concludes that his Aristophanic *lemma* "strongly suggests that πατρῷος *could* be interpreted as 'whose province is the relationship between fathers and children' ". If so, both it and ματρῷος would have special impact whenever reference was made to an act taboo or especially shocking between parent and child.

An extremely mild transfer, or at least sharing, of an epithet appears in three passages from Pindar:

Nem. 10.17. σπέρμ' ἀδείμαντον . . . Ἡρακλέος

(A man's essential qualities belong to the seed from which he springs. Cf. *Pyth.* 4.15 ἀστέων ῥίζαν . . . μελησίμβροτον.)

Ol. 1.66 τὸ ταχύποτμον . . . ἀνέρων ἔθνος

(What is true of members of a group must be true of the group as a whole.)

Enallages are found several times in the context of a marriage:

Aesch. *PV* 855-6 συγγενῆ γάμον ἀνεψιῶν

Soph. *Ant.* 980 lyr. ματρὸς . . . ἀνύμφευτον γονάν

Soph. *El.* 492-3 lyr. ἄλεκτρ' ἄνυμφα . . . μιαιφόνων
γάμων ἁμιλλήμαθ'

Soph. *Trach.* 527 lyr. τὸ δ' ἀμφινείκητον ὄμμα νύμφας

Eur. *Hipp.* 1140-1 lyr. νυμφιδία δ' ἀπόλωλε φυγᾷ σᾷ
λέκτρων ἅμιλλα κούραις

The marriage bed also appears at Soph. *Ant.* 862-4 (already quoted) and at

Eur. *IA* 1266 λέκτρων ἁρπαγὰς Ἑλληνικῶν

Parentage is the theme in

Soph. *OT* 869-70 lyr. θνατὰ φύσις ἀνέρων / ἔτικτεν

and childbirth in

Eur. *Phoen.* 30 τὸν ἐμὸν ὠδίνων πόνων [1]

Several enallages deal with parents and children. There are probably two instances at Aesch. *Ag.* 50-4 anap.:

ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων
ὕπατοι λεχέων στροφοδινοῦνται
πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι,
δεμνιοτήρη πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες

(Triclinius remarks: δέον δὲ εἰπεῖν ἐκπατίων παίδων, ἐκπατίοις εἶπε πρὸς τὸ ἄλγεσιν. I argue elsewhere [pp. 53 ff.] that his interpretation is correct and that Hesychius was right in assigning δεμνιοτήρη to ὀρτάλιχοι). The enallage at Aesch. *Sept.* 348-50 lyr.

βλαχαὶ δ' αἱματόεσσαι
τῶν ἐπιμαστιδίων
ἀρτιτρεφεῖς βρέμονται,

has a descendant in Eur. *Cyc.* 58-9 lyr.

ποθοῦσί σ' ἁμερόκοιτοι
βλαχαὶ σμικρῶν τεκέων.

And the one at Soph. *OT* 1375-6

ἀλλ' ἡ τέκνων δῆτ' ὄψις ἦν ἐφίμερος,
βλαστοῦσ' ὅπως ἔβλαστε

has a parallel in one of the rare prose examples:

Appian *B.C.* 4.89 ἥδοντο . . . ἐπὶ τῇ ὄψει τοῦ πλήθους ἰσχυροτάτῃ σφίσι φανείσῃ.

L and P have the following for the text of Eur. *El.* 450 lyr.:

Θέτιδος εἰνάλιον γόνον

Denniston remarks: "εἰνάλιον is a strange epithet to apply to Achilles. εἰναλίου [Walberg], a negligible change, is certainly right". I would keep the MSS. reading on the ground that it stresses the close link between mother and son.

[1] A curious transferred epithet, not an enallage, at Hes. *Theog.* 319 occurs in a birth context: see West.

The other Euripidean examples in the parent-child category are formed with pronominal possessive adjectives:

Andr. 584 οὑμὸς . . . παῖς παιδός

Andr. 1063 σῷ . . . παιδὸς παιδί

Bacch. 1327-8 σὸς . . . παῖς παιδός

Ion 281 χάσμα σὸν . . . χθονός

IA 784 lyr. ἐμοῖσι τέκνων τέκνοις

Taken together, enallage in family contexts shows a multiply determined form of poetic language. It seems fairly probable that the genitival function was more strongly felt in πατρῷος and ματρῷος than in other adjectives and that this feature (perhaps made especially prominent in prayers by a special semantic circumstance) lies behind the Sophoclean usage. The logic of blood relationship and its potential for the poetry of a culture in which family solidarity was of immense importance certainly motivates many of the examples. Collective noun enallage does not merit a special diachronic position: it is less striking in itself than the other types and it did not have a notable part in the language of prayer. Pronominal possessive enallage, though an old type, was drawn into family contexts (exclusively by Euripides) after other forms of enallage had already been used: otherwise it would be strange that Pindar, who has expressions like τεὰ τιμὰ ποδῶν (*Ol.* 12.13-17) never says e.g. σὸς παῖς παιδός.

Two-Word Expressions

The close relation of adjective to genitive in early Greek also lies behind expressions like κρητῆρα ἐλεύθερον (*Il.* 6.528), νόστιμον ἦμαρ (*Od.* 1.9), εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν (Aesch. *Ag.* 262), ἀνδρόφθορον αἷμα (Soph. *Ant.* 1022), and γηγενῆ μάχην (Eur. *Ion* 987). They are often discussed in conjunction with enallage (e.g. Lobeck, Kühner-Gerth, pp. 26 ff., Schwyzer, p. 180) because the adjective in both types is closely related to the genitive case of a noun, unexpressed in the two-word form, expressed in the enallage, but in a case different from the adjective. Although scholars have not, to my knowledge, explicitly defined the diachronic relation between the types, the order of presentation in the grammars suggests that the enallage is regarded as a secondary, extended form (showing the concealed genitive) of the two-word expression. But if Watkins is right in

granting the genitive antiquity equal to the adjective's (see pp. 21 f.), it is unnecessary to deem enallage a secondary development. (The archaism of the two-word form would be probable even if Homeric examples were not attested: see Appendix D for distribution in Kastner "Wortfelder"). Of course the use of one type could well have prompted the use of the other.

Lobeck and Schwyzer regard the Homeric χλωρὸν δέος (*Il.* 7.479) as similar to enallage. This is probably wrong: the expression sounds like a very old metaphor the history of whose meaning few would ever stop to ponder; if any ellipse was felt, it would not have been specifically an ellipse of the genitive of the sufferer; further, I am aware of no enallage in which the adjective must be understood proleptically.

CHAPTER FOUR

ENALLAGE IN PINDAR AND THE TRAGEDIANS

Because there are very few examples, a survey of enallage in poets other than Pindar and the tragedians can be given in a few pages.

As has been already noted (p. 23), there is a widely accepted enallage in Homer at *Od.* 14.197. R. Pfeiffer suggests that the ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς ἡρώων of the third and fourth lines of the *Iliad* might be an enallage.[1] More likely it is ironic (like *Il.* 18.317, where Achilles places χεῖρας ἀνδροφόνους on Patroclus) or just inappropriate (like *Od.* 1.29 ἀμύμονος Αἰγίσθοιο). F. Sommer contends that metrical considerations have caused a displacement of the adjective from the governing substantive *to* the dependent genitive in *Od.* 11.11.[2] He remarks: "Solchem Einzelfall den Titel einer 'Enallage inversa' zu verleihen lohnt sich kaum". There are also the periphrases formed with κάρηνα (cf. p. 16).

Elsewhere in the Homeric corpus I have found only

Hymn. Hom. Cer. 14-15 ἁλμυρὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης.

Hesiod has only the logical enallage at fr. 33 a. 20 M-W:

Νηλῆος ἀγακλειτὸν περὶ τεῖχος

Giangrande's remark that this type of logical enallage was "destined to become more and more frequent in Epic"[3] is baffling. Examples known to me in, say, Apollonius, are not of this form. (There are quasi-enallages at *Theog.* 319 and 335: see West.)

To my knowledge, the only enallage in early elegiac, iambic, and lyric authors is the one used by Simonides:

111.43B Σκιρωνικὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης

Headlam observes: "When epithets transferred are found in Comedy, they are always in burlesque of Lyric style or of Tragic". He lists the following examples:

---

[1] *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 1968), p. 147, n. 4.
[2] *Sybaris, Festschrift Hans Krahe* (Wiesbaden, 1958), p. 158.
[3] *CR*, n.s. 20 (1970), p. 153.

Ar. *Av.* 250 ἐπὶ πόντιον οἶδμα θαλάσσης

Ar. *Av.* 1198 δίνης πτερωτὸς φθόγγος

Ar. *Pax* 155 χρυσοχάλινον πάταγον ψαλίων

χρυσοχαλίνων Bergk

Ar. *Vesp.* 838 τροφαλίδα τυροῦ Σικελικὴν

Cratin. 220 χαίρετε δαίμονες οἳ . . . Βοιώτιον οὖθαρ ἀρούρης

(The introductory words establish the hieratic character of the language.)

Anaxandr. 41.37 τερενόχρωτες μαζῶν ὄψεις

Antiph. 217.21 πυρωτοῖς ἀνθράκων ῥαπίσμασιν

An πυρωτῶν? Blaydes [1]

There is a possible enallage immediately before the one Headlam saw in Antiphanes:

217.20-1 λευκαυγῆ φύσιν σαρκός

(But cf. p. 18).

And another culinary enallage:

Anaxandr. 33.16 ἑφθοῖς προσώποις ἰχθύων

Lobeck notes

Ar. *Lys.* 261 Θάσιον οἴνου σταμνίον,

which has to do with drink, and an example which refers to an oracular response:

Ar. *Plut.* 45-6 τὴν ἐπίνοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ
φράζουσαν

Anaxandr. 41.37 is of special interest because ὄψις is given the adjective in two other enallages of widely varying dates, Soph. *OT* 1375 and Appian *B.C.* 4.89.

Despite their love for figures of speech, Hellenistic poets made sparing use of enallage. I am aware only of the following examples:

Ap. Rhod. 1.1023-4 ἀνδρῶν Μακριέων . . . Πελασγικὸν ἄρεα

Ap. Rhod. 4.1519 λαιὸν . . . ταρσὸν ποδός

Ap. Rhod. 4.1780 Εὐβοίης . . . Ὀπούντιά τ' ἄστεα Λοκρῶν

(In Apollonius above all one would expect to find the logical enallages described by Giangrande.)

---

[1] *Adversia in Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Halle, 1890), p. 360.

Callim. fr. 112.9 Pf. Μουσέων πεζὸν . . . νόμον

(Pfeiffer compares Horace's *Musa pedestris.*)

Theoc. *Id.* 17.126 πιανθέντα βοῶν ... μηρία

(Gow: "for πιανθέντων as, e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 793 νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον").

Lycoph. 831-2 Γαύαντος τάφον ... μουσόφθαρτον

Anth. Pal. 6.233.6 πριστὸν ψήκτρας κνῆσμα σιδηρόδετον

Anth. Pal. 7.334.3 δι' ἐμὴν βιότοιο τελευτήν

Mellino apud Stobaeum 12.11 Hense-Wachsmuth
σᾷ δ' ὑπὰ σδεύγλᾳ κρατερῶν λεπάδνων

Headlam has numerous citations of enallage, all formed with proper names, in Nonnus. By his time, however, the influence of Latin usage is surely at work.

Enallage in Pindar [1]

The following passages are presented in accordance with the chronological order given by C. M. Bowra (pp. 407-13).

Pyth. 10.20-1 μὴ φθονεραῖς ἐκ θεῶν μετατροπίαις ἐπικύραιεν

A quasi-enallage (see p. 1). Elsewhere in Greek φθονερός is applied to persons, gods, or thoughts. The expression is euphemestic compared with φθονερῶν ἐκ θεῶν μετατροπίαις.

Pyth. 10.36 γελᾷ θ' ὁρῶν ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων

ὄρθιος here means "ithyphallic" (LSJ *Suppl.*). Bowra (p. 305) translates, "He laughs as he sees the beasts' highcocked presumption". The enallage contributes obliqueness to a very refined obscenity. Since Pindar is describing sacrificial asses, syntax associated with prayer is quite in order.

Pyth. 6.5. Πυθιόνικος ὕμνων θησαυρός

Williger (pp. 22 f.) misuses parallel passages when he argues that it is inconsistent to classify as enallages both this expression and Θήρωνος 'Ολυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον (*Ol.* 3.3). The question is of the *relative* applicability of the adjective to the two nouns in the specific expression. Proof is impossible, but we can quite confidently estab-

---

[1] This synchronic discussion and the ones that follow do not touch on all enallages known to me in Pindar and the tragedians.

lish a hierarchy: Ὀλυμπιόνικος and Πυθιόνικος would be taken with the name of the victor rather than with the epinician, with the epinician rather than θησαυρός.

Isthm. 8.3 πατρὸς ἀγλαὸν ... παρὰ πρόθυρον

Ol. 1.42 ὕπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διός

Men are frequently called ἀγλαοί and Zeus is often called ὕπατος.[1] The enallage is logical rather than syntactical: objects have certain qualities because their owners have them (cf. Giangrande, *loc. cit.* p. 43, n. 3).

Ol. 1.48 ὕδατος ... πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν

The scholiast explains ὕδατος ἀκμάν as ὕδωρ ἀκμαίως ζέον. But in other attestations any adverbial force of preposition + ἀκμή is temporal (see LSJ s.v.; the one citation with εἰς [Eur. *HF* 532] is translated "in the nick of time"). It is simpler to understand ζέοισαν as transferred from ὕδατος. As usual, the literal meaning makes some sense; the highest part of a body of boiling water is the most agitated.

Pyth. 9.83 λευκίπποισι Καδμείων ... ἀγυιαῖς

Gildersleeve compares πλάξιππον Θήβαν (*Ol.* 6.85) and Βοιωτοὶ πλήξιπποι (Hes. *Scut.* 24). Williger (pp. 23 f.) denies the presence of enallage: "...nach Wilamowitz zu Eur. Herc.[2] S. 176 ein starkes Beispiel der Enallage. Wilamowitz kommt es darauf an, dass die Strassen nicht belebt gedacht sind; das ist nun in keinem Fall nötig. Denn wenn auch hier wie Pyth. 8.55 die ἀγυιαί für die Stadt stehen, so kann das Wort gerade bei Pindar gleichzeitig in seinem eigentlichen Sinne verstanden werden (Personifikation und sächliche Bedeutung gehen durcheinander; ... λεύκιπποι ἀγυιαί kann also ganz anschaulich gemeint sein: Strassen, die von weissen Rossen belebt sind...)". Against this, I think it is right to insist that when an expression includes a word for men known for their white horses the first instinct must have been to assign that word the adjective; other possibilities, e.g. that the streets are animated, came to mind later.

Nem. 3.59 θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι

θαλασσίων Moschopulos

Pindar's tendency is to modify the more abstract word: cf. τεὰ

[1] See Fraenkel ad *Ag.* 55.

τιμὰ ποδῶν (*Ol.* 12.13), φρενῶν καρπὸν ἀμώμητον (*Pyth.* 2.73; Jacob proposed ἀμωμήτων), ὠκυπόρους κυμάτων ῥιπάς (*Pyth.* 4.194), ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου (*Pyth.* 4.255), χειρῶν ἄωτον ἐπίνικον (*Ol.* 8.75; Gildersleeve translates: "The victorious prime of their hands", "the fruit of their victorious hands"), σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον (*Isthm.* 7.18), ἀτελῆ σοφίας καρπόν (fr. 197 Bowra). θαλασσίαις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι is surely an enallage, but classification of many of the other expressions would be problematical.

Ol. 10.5-6 ἐρύκετον ψευδέων
ἐνιπὰν ἀλιτόξενον

ἀλιτοξένων Mingarelli

Gildersleeve: "...much more poetic than ἀλιτοξένων with ψευδέων". Perhaps the enallage is deliberately equivocal. Taken as a transferred epithet it means that Pindar has been rebuked for deceits that sin against his friends; but following the grammatical concord, the meaning is that the rebuke itself sins against Pindar, who a few lines later observes that payment with interest satisfies a debt (9-12):

ὅμως δὲ λῦσαι δυνατὸς ὀξεῖαν ἐπιμομφὰν τόκος· ὁρᾶτ' ὧν νῦν
ψᾶφον ἐλισσομέναν
ὁπᾷ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον,
ὁπᾷ τε κοινὸν λόγον
φίλαν τείσομεν ἐς χάριν.

(Cf. also lines 86 ff.). If my speculation is correct, Pindar is upbraiding his ξένοι with utmost tact for their impatience or lack of trust in him. (I see no reason to follow Gildersleeve's statement [p. 213] that "the poet poetically feigns that he has forgotten" the debt).

Ol. 12.13-17 υἱὲ Φιλάνορος, ἤτοι καὶ τεά κεν
ἐνδομάχας ἅτ' ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ' ἑστίᾳ
ἀκλεὴς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησεν ποδῶν,
εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ' ἄμερσε πάτρας

The three words of the enallage are separated to an unusual degree, which suggests that Pindar wished to throw specially great emphasis on the abstraction, τιμά, he is grotesquely comparing to a cock.

Pyth. 4.15 ἀστέων ῥίζαν ... μελησίμβροτον

A case of weak enallage if, as I think, the audience would be reminded of expressions like Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα (*Od.* 12.70).

Nem. 6.44 Φλειοῦντος ὑπ' ὠγυγίοις ὄρεσιν

Bergk reads ὠγυγίοι', arguing *nullus umquam Graecorum poetarum montes dixit antiquos, recte vero ager Phliasiorum, in quo multa erant prisci temporis monumenta multaeque fabulae ab ultima antiquitate repetitae ferebantur, dicitur* ὠγύγιος.[1] Wilamowitz, retaining the MSS. reading, sees an enallage.

Ol. 8.42 ἀμφὶ τεαῖς . . . χερὸς ἐργασίαις

ἐργασία is rarely concrete: LSJ gives only Thuc. 6.27, 7.6. Since Pindar frequently uses enallage with abstract nouns, his use of the device here emphasizes the rather unusual use of the word.

Ol. 8.68 ἐν τέτρασιν παίδων . . . γυίοις

Gildersleeve: "Emphasis on the important element". But γυῖον denotes the whole body at *Nem.* 7.73. Enallage with numbers is very unusual (only Aesch. *Ag.* 504 comes to mind).

Pindar's tendency is to exclude enallage from his myths, except for quotations within a myth. Those instances which do fall within a myth are for the most part taken from the most common or colorless categories. For example, *Pyth.* 4.225 ὑμετέρας ἀκτῖνος ὄλβου is formed with the possessive pronominal, *Ol.* 1.42 ὕπατον δῶμα Διός is of the "possessor-possessed" type, and *Pyth.* 4.149 βοῶν ξανθὰς ἀγέλας and 205 φοίνισσα ἀγέλα ταύρων are collective noun enallages. Significantly, *Ol.* 8.42 τεαῖς χερὸς ἐργασίαις is found within a prophetic utterance.

The possible enallage at *Ol.* 10.24-25 occurs in a transition to the myth:

> ἀγῶνα δ' ἐξαίρετον ἀεῖσαι θέμιτες ὦρσαν Διός, ὃν ἀρχαίῳ σάματι
> πὰρ Πέλοπος
> πόνων ἑξάριθμον ἐκτίσσατο.

The mention of θέμιτες Διός suggests the influence of hieratic language.

I know of only four "bold" enallages within the myths: *Pyth.* 10.36 ὕβριν ὀρθίαν κνωδάλων, *Ol.* 1.48 ὕδατος ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν, *Pyth.* 9.83 λευκίπποισι Καδμείων ἀγυιαῖς, *Nem.* 3.59 θαλασσίοις ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖσι.

---

[1] Quoted from Rumpel, *op. cit.* (p. 18) s.v. ὠγύγιος.

Enallage in Tragedy

The tragedians used enallage almost exclusively in lyric sections and iambic trimeters. There appear to be only seven possible exceptions:

Anapests

Aesch. *Ag.* 50 ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων

Aesch. *Ag.* 53-4 δεμνιοτήρη πόνον ὀρταλίχων

Aesch. *Ch.* 1070 ἀνδρὸς βασίλεια πάθη

Aesch. *Sept.* 1076-7 ἀλλοδάπῳ κύματι φωτῶν

Soph. *Trach.* 993 ὦ Κηναία κρηπὶς βωμῶν

Trochees

Aesch. *Pers.* 247 δράμημα φωτὸς Περσικόν

Eur. *IA* 394 μωρίᾳ τῇ σῇ φρενῶν

This rigidity is not surprising. Enallage will be shown to be a feature of diction of two kinds: formal and ornate. Greek poets did not intend it to suggest emotion overwhelming logic. Thus enallage is not appropriate to meters characteristically employed for marching or in singing dirges (anapests, whether "recitative" or "melic"), for "agitated lamentations" (dochmiacs—Denniston's phrase), or great excitement (trochees).

Their very rareness makes the possible exceptions harmless to my general interpretation of enallage. Further, of the trochaic examples, the first dates from a period when the tragic practice in regard to the device might not yet have been established; the second is the colorless type formed with the pronominal possessive. And except for Eur. *IA* 394 all these instances fall within one or another of the Kastner "Wortfelder".

The use of enallage in iambic sections is also revealing. A large majority of all iambic examples can be placed in one of a few categories: pronominal possessives, apostrophes,[1] or Kastner "Wortfelder" members. In Aeschylus I have found three exceptions (*Ag.*

[1] Although apostrophe in the form ὦ + vocative can be used to express strong emotion (cf. Long, pp. 99,115), as used with enallage it is essentially a feature of the high style because it is associated with prayers, salutations made upon returning to one's native land, and the like. It is noteworthy that there are no enallages with the plain vocative, which is the marked correlate in Attic of ὦ + vocative (see Householder-Nagy, p. 765).

504, *Supp.* 236-7, 320; the first is in the context of an apostrophe) out of some seventeen reasonably certain enallages; in Sophocles six (*Ant.* 26, *El.* 1177, *OT* 532-3, *Phil.* 83, *Trach.* 669-70, fr. 841) out of some twenty-nine; in Euripides eight (*Alc.* 23, *Andr.* 159, *HF* 288, 543, *Hipp.* 395-6, *Phoen.* 100, 1635, *Tro.* 1220) out of some thirty. In many of these exceptions special circumstances prevail: see the remarks on the individual authors.

Enallage in Aeschylus

I assume the following chronological order for the plays of Aeschylus: *Persae*, *Septem*, *Supplices* (accepting 463 B.C. as the date of production on the evidence of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2256.3), *Oresteia*, *Prometheus*.

Persae

58 lyr. δειναῖς βασιλέως ὑπὸ πομπαῖς

Broadhead: "The earlier ed[itors] took βασιλέως ὑπὸ πομπαῖς as = *regis ductu*, and they have been followed by Sidg[wick] and Tucker, 'under the guidance of the King' ... But for this meaning of πομπαῖς the epithet δεινός is not very suitable, and I prefer with many other scholars to understand 'commands' ". Perhaps we have an enallage here. If so, Broadhead's objections to taking πομπή as "guidance", or "escort", loses its force. δεινός with the meaning "dread" is, *pace* LSJ, never applied to humans in Homer, and after Homer it usually means "clever" or "skillful" if applied to a man. But the Great King is no mere human in the eyes of his subjects and so can be called "dread".

81-2 lyr. κυάνεον δ' ὄμμασι
φονίου δέργμα δράκοντος

Here the enallage is certain. Broadhead's examples refute his conclusions: "κυάνεον] properly 'dark-blue'. When applied to the eye (βλεφάρων κυανεάων, Hes. *Sc.* 7) and eyebrows (ὀφρύσι κυαναυγέσι, *Alc.* 261) it seems to mean simply 'dark' ('grim glare', Stanford). Since this adj[ective] is applied several times to serpents (e.g. Λ 26), some ed[itors] take κυάνεον here to be a transferred epithet. I prefer to take it strictly of the glance: cf. πυρὸς δράκοντ' ἀναβλέποντα φοινίαν φλόγα (*Ion* 1262-3), δράκων στίλβει ... ἀστραπάς (*Or.* 479-80), and Homer's well-known simile ὡς δὲ δράκων ... σμερδαλέον δέδορκεν (X 93-5)". To be sure, dark things can gleam—that is the point

of κυαναυγῆς—but a serpent's glance was pictured as brilliant fire or lightning, not at all as something dark. Broadhead's last citation demonstrates only that the serpent's glance was sometimes said to be horrifying. Here, as often, enallage allows a poet to accumulate adjectives without resorting to an ungainly crowd of genitive endings.[1]

247 trochaic τοῦδε γὰρ δράμημα φωτὸς Περσικὸν πρέπει μαθεῖν
περσικοῦ Blomfield

Cf. *Supp.* 236-7 οὐ γὰρ Ἀργολὶς ἐσθῆς γυναικῶν. Both are probably enallages.[2] Broadhead explains: " 'The running of this man is clearly Persian (for us) to recognise', i.e. is clearly that of a Persian. The man runs like a Persian courier ... [I do not think] Περσικὸν is a case of enallage..." Groeneboom rightly observes that the rhythm points to Περσικόν as a predicate adjective, but this does not exclude the possibility of understanding it with φωτός: the genitive case is frequently used as a predicate.[3] "Argolic garb" is an ordinary locution; "Persian running", although unusual, is intelligible. But what is crucial is that in the three-word expressions the adjectives are understood with the words for "man" and "woman" because "Argolic woman" and "Persian man" were much more commonly heard pairs of words.

751-2 δέδοικα μὴ πολὺς πλούτου πόνος
οὑμὸς ἀνθρώποις γένηται τοῦ φθάσαντος ἀπαργή

If there is enallage here, it is the only example in the play spoken by a main character. (Broadhead claims that "the adjectives qualify the whole phrase πλούτου πόνος.")

Septem

171-2 lyr. κλύετε παρθένων κλύετε πανδίκως
χειροτόνους λιτάς

Groeneboom: "χειροτόνους λιτάς feitelijk zijn het de meisjes, die de handen omhoog heffen, maar het epitheton, dat haar toekomt, wordt aan de gebeden gegeven". An instance where the audience would spot an enallage easily missed by readers of the text: the audience would see the chorus of women stretching out their hands.

---

[1] The reading δέρμα (M) might show reluctance to take κυάνεον with δέργμα and a failure to observe the enallage.

[2] We surely cannot call one enallage but not the other.

[3] Kühner-Gerth, pp. 371 ff.

348-50 lyr. βλαχαὶ δ' αἱματόεσσαι
τῶν ἐπιμαστιδίων
ἀρτιτρεφεῖς βρέμονται

Headlam comments: "I think ... the inaccurate attachment of the epithets has ... [the value] of producing an effect intentionally confused, *impressionistic*. Infants at their mothers' breast, besmeared with blood, and passionately crying in their bleating voice; if you wish to convey the impressions vaguely flashed upon the eye and ear, you dab the various colors in among the substantives". Though I would endorse his appreciation of this passage, it should be noted that this enallage is among the most startling and impressive in Greek: the impressionistic effect is not characteristic. (Typically, the scholion in M does not mention the enallage, even though it recognizes that it is the infants who are bloodied.)

724-5 lyr. τὰς περιθύμους κατάρας Οἰδιπόδα

Cited as enallage by Kühner-Gerth, but I am not convinced they are right. *Sept.* 171-2 seems more certain.

1008 θάπτειν ἔδοξε γῆς φίλαις κατασκαφαῖς

Probably not an enallage: cf. p. 11. At any rate, the Herald is making an official proclamation of the resolutions of the Theban authorities.

Supplices

It is significant that in the *Supplices*, the only extant tragedy in which the chorus is the principal character, the Danaids do not utter a single enallage. One possible example (1041-2) is spoken by the chorus of serving women, the rest by King Pelasgus in iambic sections.

320 τὸ πάνσοφον ... ὄνομα τούτου

πανσόφου Tyrwhitt πανσπόρου Hartung παντόσεμνον Weil

From the King's interrogation of the Danaids. The emendations show some unease with the construction. Weil's παντόσεμνον, though it retains the accusative, would eliminate the possibility of enallage: the name itself would be august (cf. Pind. *Ol.* 6.57 ὄνυμ' ἀθάνατον, Soph. *OC* 41 σεμνὸν ὄνομ').

482 βωμοὺς ἐπ' ἄλλους δαιμόνων ἐγχωρίων

A very complicated case. Lobeck (followed by Linwood [1]) saw an

[1] *Lexicon to Aeschylus* (London, 1847) s.v. ἄλλος.

enallage if the reading in M is correct. Arsenius of Monembasia, who copied the *Supplices* directly from M,[1] has ἄλλων.[2] I can only guess what Arsenius, Lobeck, and Linwood had in mind. If we have enallage at v. 482 it must be because Pelasgus is instructing Danaus to propitiate *other* gods, not merely to place boughs on other altars of the *same* gods; presumably it would be redundant to do so, unless the point is simply to let the Argives see the devotion taking place (cf. 501 ἡγεῖσθε βωμοὺς ἀστικούς, θεῶν ἕδρας which prevents our identifying the δαίμονες as local heroes). The Danaids are suppliants at the shared precinct of the ἀγώνιοι θεοί (vv. 189, 242), i.e. " 'gods in assembly', *di consentes* is the proper sense ('who are together')" (Fraenkel ad *Ag.* 513). These are probably the "Twelve Gods".[3] The strongest evidence that there are two sets of divinities to propitiate comes at vv. 520-1:

πρὸς ταῦτα μίμνε καὶ θεοὺς ἐγχωρίους
λιταῖς παρατοῦ τῶν σ' ἔρως ἔχει τυχεῖν

We can assume that Pelasgus realizes that the suppliants have already prayed to the gods whose precinct they occupy. Perhaps deities with local cults would have special influence on the Argive citizens, themselves called ἐγχώριοι at v. 517, on whose vote the suppliants' fate depends.

The King has been speaking with deep emotion of this dilemma. But when he turns to Danaus at v. 480, he has decided on his course of action and is fully controlled when he gives his instructions.

1041-2 lyr. Ἁρμονίᾳ μοῖρ' Ἀφοδίτας ψευδρά

ψευδρᾶς Porson

For ψιθυρά (meaning the same as ψευδρά) as an epithet of Aphrodite see LSJ. But the text is extremely difficult (I give only an emendation relevant to enallage) and there can be no certainty.

Agamemnon

50 anap. ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων

This was understood as enallage by Triclinius, whose interpretation, δέον δὲ εἰπεῖν ἐκπατίων παίδων, ἐκπατίοις, εἶπε πρὸς τὸ ἄλγεσιν (quoted from Fraenkel), has been adopted by many scholars.

---

[1] A. Turyn, *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* (New York, 1943), p. 21.

[2] According to G. Hermann, *Aeschyli Tragoediae* (2nd ed.; Berlin, 1859).

[3] See Wecklein on v. 222 [228 Wecklein].

Fraenkel argues that the spatial sense of the word, which he renders "off the beaten track", "lonely", is inconsistent with the supposed enallage: "Such an 'enallage' is out of the question". Against this, Page claims that the proper spatial meaning is "missing from their familiar ground". He is right to insist, "The whole point of the word lies in the fact that the nestlings are *not* in their natural home; they are *missing*", and in seeing enallage ("The attachment of the adjective to the sufferings instead of the sufferers is unusually bold, comparable with χλοεραῖς λείμακος ἡδοναῖς in E. *Ba.* 866 f."). Actually, enallage is possible with either spatial meaning of ἐκπατίοις. Only the non-spatial meaning *enormis*, "excessive" precludes enallage, since the nestlings are, of course, small.[1]

Fraenkel's aesthetic argument against the interpretation espoused by Page is feeble: "We are here at the point where the poet makes a transition from the account of a particular event to the scene in nature with which he compares it, and at this point he would hardly anticipate the visual details, the local colouring of the simile drawn from the life of the great birds. It is much more effective if first we have the expression of the feeling common to both men and birds, and only at a later stage . . . the details penetrate into the picture". Aeschylus at once gives the reason for the vultures' anguish by including ἐκπατίοις (meaning "missing"), but the word is applicable to both human and animal spheres. It by no means forces on the listener an *image* of an empty nest any more than that of an empty bed. Metaphor, as I. A. Richards has taught us,[2] need not do its work by comparing images: most often, as in the verse in question, the process is non-visual.

The reading preferred by Page *more* powerfully expresses "the feeling common to both men and birds" precisely because we know the *reason*, and thus the quality, of the emotion. If ἐκπατίοις simply meant "overmastering", as Fraenkel would have it, we would know only its magnitude.

53-5 anap. δεμνιοτήρη
πόνον ὀρταλίχων ὀλέσαντες

Taken by the scholiast who is cited by Hesychius s.v. δεμνιοτήρης as enallage (though the term itself is, of course, not used): καθότι αἱ

[1] Prof. Finley suggests that the contrast may be between sorrows in the wilderness and in cities.

[2] *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York, 1936), ch. 5.

νεοσσοὶ ἔτι τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν ὡς τὰ δέμνια τηρεῖν καὶ κατέχειν, μηδέπω πέτεσθαι δυνάμενοι. πόνον δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν τροφὴν αὐτῶν (quoted from Fraenkel). Fraenkel endorses the meaning given δεμνιοτήρης, but will not accept an enallage: "The interpretation in Hesychius is ... wrong in referring δεμνιοτήρη to the unfledged young cowering in the nest. The attribute is clearly intended to qualify the toil itself, and must be understood of the parent birds guarding their brood. The genitive ὀρταλίχων depends on πόνος (toilsome watch over..., toil for ...)..." This statement is not persuasive. The young birds stay in the nest *all* the time; the parents visit the nest only periodically to bring food. Further, a vulture might be bored doing guard duty, but it would not suffer the painful exertion which πόνος connotes; the incessant search for food, on the other hand, is naturally called a πόνος. Therefore the adjective is more easily understood with ὀρταλίχων.

153 lyr. νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφυτον
συμφύτων Auratus

For once Fraenkel is quite right to deny the presence of what he calls the "long-suffering figure of hypallage or enallage". Iphigeneia's sacrifice, being thoroughly personified, is regarded as "born in the house and grown one with it" (Fraenkel). It is also true, however, that the adjective might be felt with νεικέων. νεῖκος cannot be ξύναιμον in ordinary language (cf. p. 2), but it can be σύμφυτον.

312-3 τοιοίδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι,
ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι

An enallage according to Williger (p. 10, n. 1), who evidently takes πληρούμενοι with λαμπαδηφόρων (see Fraenkel's reference to Weil for πληροῦσθαι of persons). The intervention of the nominative ἄλλος, however, makes it most unlikely that the participle would have been felt with λαμπαδηφόρων.

503 ἰὼ πατρῷον οὖδας 'Αργείας χθονός

Fraenkel shows that ἰώ in iambic trimeters expresses strong excitement. But even if the Herald is "a man quite overcome by his feelings and indulging them freely", the utterance is still in the grand manner and there is no reason to suppose that the enallage stems from his emotions overpowering his syntax.

504 δεκάτῳ . . . φέγγει τῷδ' . . . ἔτους

δεκάτου Jacob [1]

Fraenkel keeps the MS. reading and invokes the "compound" theory of enallage. Page insists on the emendation, arguing that ἔτους-φέγγος is not, as Fraenkel claims, a "natural combination like μηνὸς-φέγγος (as in Eur. *Ion* 1486)". The disagreement of these two scholars shows how arbitrary the identification of "coalescing substantives" can be.

743-4 lyr. μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος
δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος

Groeneboom observes: "het epitheton μαλθακόν vormt een oxymoron met βέλος, gelijk in het volgende vers δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος". Just possibly Aeschylus also intended an enallage.[2] With the second Fraenkel (following Blomfield) compares Soph. fr. 841 (757 Nauck) ἔρωτος δῆγμα παιδικόν (Pearson, rejecting Valckenaer's παιδικοῦ, remarks that the phrase as written "is no more strange than νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον"). Yet Fraenkel does not even mention the possibility of enallage. He is right in stressing the effect created by "the avoidance of the person" in the description of Helen, but misleading in his claim that "The whole of what is here described has no shade of indistinctness, but rather is conceived and expressed with perfect clearness". The part of the strophe which ends with vv. 743-4 is almost impressionistic—very different from the usual concreteness of Greek poetry. The use of enallage (whether once or twice) seems here to contribute to the dream-like quality.

Choephoroi

30-1 lyr. πρόστερνοι στολμοὶ πέπλων ἀγελάστοις
ξυμφοραῖς πεπληγμένοι

πεπληγμένοι Wilamowitz πεπληγμένων codd.

Enallage, if this is the correct reading: see Williger, p. 9, n. 1. Keeping πεπληγμένων there is, according to Sidgwick, another sort of transfer: " 'Struck with woeful calamities', a phrase properly to the *persons*, is boldly and effectively transferred to the *robes*, as

---

[1] Murray in the O.C.T. attributes the emendation to Wunder.

[2] It is reassuring to find J. Finley's translation, "an arrow from soft eyes" (*Pindar and Aeschylus* [Cambridge, Mass., 1955], p. 257).

though the blow of the hand rending the robe *was* the blow of fate which caused the grief".

1070 anap. ἀνδρὸς βασίλεια πάθη

Enallage in the judgement of Kühner-Gerth and Bruhn (category II). Groeneboom, who thinks the adjective stands for βασιλέως, compares Aesch. *Pers.* 8 ἀμφὶ δὲ νόστῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ but there, there is more reason to take the adjective substantively: the noun referred to has been spoken in v. 5, but does not appear in the sentence which the phrase in question opens. The pleonasm ἀνδρὸς βασιλέως is possible (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1627 ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ), but keeping βασίλεια purely adjectival has the advantage of making the πάθη more impressive. (Sidgwick thinks the line "looks ... like a gloss, especially as there is no connecting particle", but a gloss is most unlikely to contain either an enallage or an adjective to be taken as the genitive of the corresponding noun).

Eumenides

292 χώρας ἐν τόποις Λιβυστικοῖς

Λιβυστικοῖς codd. Λιβυστικῆς Auratus

This is the first of two possible enallages given to a major character in the *Oresteia*; the second, *Eum.* 457, is also spoken by Orestes. Significantly, it not only falls within an invocation to a goddess, but specifically in the highly traditional recitation of her customary haunts (cf. Dodds ad Eur. *Bacch.* 556-9).

457 Τροίαν ἄπολιν Ἰλίου πόλιν

A dubious case. Headlam comments that the MS. reading is defensible if Τροίαν is taken as an adjective.

Prometheus Vinctus

88-91 ὦ δῖος αἰθὴρ καὶ ταχύπτεροι πνοαί,
ποταμῶν τε πηγαί, ποντίων τε κυμάτων
ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα, παμμῆτόρ τε γῆ,
καὶ τὸν πανόπτην κύκλον ἡλίου καλῶ·

Prometheus' first speech. The enallage (or enallages: see p. 18 on πανόπτην κύκλον ἡλίου) comes in an impressive apostrophe to the universe. A Greek poet might have spoken of laughter, or as some scholars think, glimmering, as unnumbered (I have not found such an expression preserved), but in the more prosaic view, waves are

called numerous (cf. *Od.* 5.54 πολέεσιν ... κύμασι, 8.232 κύμασιν ἐν πολλοῖς).

It may be more than coincidence that the enallage in *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 14 is preceded by a reference to the sky and the earth and that the ocean is said to laugh:

πᾶς δ' οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
γαῖά τε πᾶσ' ἐγέλασσε καὶ ἁλμύρον οἶδμα θαλάσσης.[1]

112 τοιάσδε ποινὰς ἀμπλακημάτων

τοιῶνδε Stanley

Kühner-Gerth see enallage. Wecklein's note shows four scholars arguing over the text without giving a thought to the possibility of enallage.

855-6 συγγενῆ γάμον ἀνεψιῶν

From Prometheus' prophecy to Io.

All possible enallages in the play are spoken by the protagonist. Two are found within an apostrophe (vv. 89-90), one (v. 112) has a legal sound (cf. Kastner "Wortfeld" 2, pp. 30 f.) and the last (vv. 855-6) comes in a speech which Prometheus could deliver with detachment since the afflictions of which he speaks are not his own.

Enallage in Sophocles

In this section I have concentrated on correlating the emotional tone of the Sophoclean usage with the formality of its diction. The evidence shows that Sophocles associated enallage more with ceremonial or elevated diction than high passion. It is especially significant that every use of the device by protagonists speaking in iambs and suffering great turmoil occurs only in one of the following forms: (1) enallage contained within an apostrophe or prayer, (2) enallage reporting the actual or potential words of someone other than the speaker, (3) enallage drawn simultaneously from the two most common categories, possessive pronominal and family context, or (4) enallage which makes its effect by being in some way inappropriate. Even in lyric passages, the usual province of the high style, enallage in a protagonist's mouth is almost always part of, or accompanied by, apostrophe.

---

[1] Cf. p. 34, n. 1.

I follow the chronological order proposed by C. H. Whitman (*Sophocles* [Cambridge, Mass., 1951], pp. 42-55).

Ajax

7-8 εὖ δέ σ' ἐκφέρει
κυνὸς Λακαίνης ὥς τις εὔρινος βάσις

This is an enallage if, as Lobeck and Jebb thought, εὔρινος is nominative.[1] As enallage, the expression εὔρινος βάσις taken literally elegantly suggests the way a hunting dog's nose determines his posture and gait (cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 4.3 τιθεῖσαι τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐπὶ γῆν λεχρίας); and it neatly combines the dog's movement and sniffing to balance Odysseus' movement and scanning (κυνηγετοῦντα καὶ μετρούμενον, understanding μετρούμενον as "with the eyes" [Jebb]). For enallage with βάσις cf. *Trach.* 964.

176 lyr. πού τινος νίκας ἀκάρπωτον χάριν

An unusual enallage in that χάριν, the noun governing the genitive, functions as a preposition, "on account of". Since the phrase shows the origin of this meaning of χάριν ("originally an accusative in apposition with the sentence", LSJ s.v. A VI 1.b) we may have some additional evidence for the antiquity of enallage.

249 lyr. θοὸν εἰρεσίας ζυγὸν ἑζόμενον

The Chorus is excitedly deliberating on its own immediate course of action (but are easily calmed by Tecmessa at vv. 263 ff.). This is a rare context for enallage, though *Phil.* 1123-4, *OC* 533, and *OC* 1687 are more unusual. By including an adjective in the accusative Sophocles emphasizes the archaic syntax of ζυγὸν ἑζόμενον (see Kühner-Gerth, pp. 313 f.).

860 ὦ φέγγος, ὦ γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον
Σαλαμῖνος, ὦ πατρῷον ἑστίας βάθρον

The first spaced group is possibly, the second certainly, an enallage. Ajax's last speech is, of course, highly charged, but the long series of apostrophes indicates formal diction.

892 τίνος βοὴ πάραυλος ἐξέβη νάπους

Jebb: "= τίνος παραύλου βοή". Kamerbeek: "the rendering *near, close at hand*, is possible (logically going with τίνος) ... More probable:

---

[1] Lobeck's remark, Εὔρινος βασις *vix sensum affert epitheti trajecti*, is strange: if the phrase is indeed an instance of enallage it would by no means be among the feeblest examples.

'ill-sounding' ". For Sophocles πάραυλος is attested in two other places with the meaning "close at hand" and LSJ gives *no* Sophoclean citation for the meaning "discordant".[1] More important, the Chorus, which has been searching for Ajax, has made numerous geographical remarks.

Antigone

26 τὸν δ' ἀθλίως θανόντα Πολυνείκους νέκυν

Antigone is here reporting a proclamation, though ἀθλίως is, of course, her own word.

862-5 lyr. ἰὼ ματρῷαι λέ-
κτρων ἆται κοιμήματά τ' αὐ-
τογέννητ' ἐμῷ πατρὶ δυσμόρου ματρός

This enallage is found in combination with two other features of Sophoclean style, "pairs of abstract nouns in speeches which are sombre or impassioned" (Long, p. 89) and the use of abstract nouns ending in -μα and -μος with rare compound adjectives (*ibid.*, p. 97).

Trachiniae

357 ὁ ῥιπτὸς Ἰφίτου μόρος

Jebb calls this phrase "a sarcastic allusion to the vivid detail with which Lichas had told the story" and compares *Ant.* 35-6 φόνον ... δημόλευστον, where "the epith[et] of the victim ... [is] transferred to the doom". If this is right, we have enallage. Kamerbeek (following Campbell) states that the phrase represents the cognate accusative ῥίπτειν μόρον. The word order seems to favor Jebb's explanation.

656 πολύκωπον ὄχημα ναός

Cf. on *Ant.* 862-5 and on *El.* 492.

669-70 προθυμίαν ἄδηλον ἔργου

An enallage, though, as Kamerbeek quite rightly remarks, "the προθυμία itself moves as it were in the dark". Deianeira is apprehensive (vv. 666 f.: ἀθυμῶ δ' εἰ φανήσομαι τάχα / κακὸν μέγ' ἐκπράξασ' ἀπ' ἐλπίδος καλῆς), not yet terrified. Further, the enallage itself falls within the content of the advice she would give another.

---

[1] One tragic fragment alone is cited for the meaning "discordant"; in Eustathius it equals παρεξηυλημένος; in Pollux παραυλέω means either "play the flute beside" or "play it ill".

815-18 ἐᾶτ' ἀφέρπειν. οὖρος ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμῶν
αὐτῇ γένοιτ' ἄπωθεν ἑρπούσῃ καλός.
ὄγκον γὰρ ἄλλως ὀνόματος τί δεῖ τρέφειν
μητρῷον, ἥτις μηδὲν ὡς τεκοῦσα δρᾷ;

Hyllus' long speech, separated from this passage only by the two lines the Chorus addresses to Deianeira as she leaves, has been in the high style (cf. Long, p. 97). Whether ὄγκος denotes pretension or dignity (see Jebb and Kamerbeek), the grandiloquent diction is here sarcastic.

964 lyr. ξένων ... ἐξόμιλος ἥδε βάσις

Long: "The Chorus ... express apprehension at the arrival of the foreign company bringing Heracles ... The antistrophe traces their increasing awareness as the men approach. ξένων ἥδε βάσις (sc. ἐστι) means no more than ξένοι βαίνουσι, but ἐξόμιλος 'foreign', is an adjective which only occurs here and it serves to emphasize the 'foreign' aspect of the men. ξένος is an ambiguous word and the Chorus need to stress that these are aliens; but it would be odd to write 'alien ξένοι' and Sophocles wants to concentrate attention on the 'coming'. Hence the βάσις itself is 'alien', an expression which is ... highly effective in its vague portrayal of anxiety" (p. 73). The enallage permits Sophocles to gloss the unfamiliar adjective with the noun in the genitive.

993 anap. ὦ Κηναία κρηπὶς βωμῶν

Enallage in an apostrophe.

Oedipus Tyrannus

108-9 ποῦ τόδ' εὑρεθήσεται
ἴχνος παλαιᾶς δυστέκμαρτον αἰτίας;

Jebb: "= ἴχνος τῆσδε αἰτίας". Kamerbeek: "Logically, it is true, τόδ' may be easily considered as an enallage for τῆσδε but τόδ' ... ἴχνος graphically represents the task now looming up in his mind". Kamerbeek is wrong in assuming that one must choose between exclusive alternatives. Perhaps we have one of the many instances where Sophocles makes Oedipus say more than he realizes. Oedipus, using ἴχνος with the meaning *vestigium*, thinks he is saying no more than ἴχνος τῆσθε αἰτίας. The audience, on the other hand, also thinks of ἴχνος with the meaning "foot" (as in Eur. *Bacch.* 1134) and understands τόδε ἴχνος of Oedipus' swollen foot, which is

hardly δυστέκμαρτον to one who knows the true history of the crime.[1]

At this stage in the drama Oedipus can speak of the crime with detachment.

532-3 οὗτος σύ, πῶς δεῦρ' ἦλθες; ἦ τοσόνδ' ἔχεις
τόλμης πρόσωπον

These verses, addressed to Creon, are more imperious than impassioned. Oedipus can still maintain an air of disinterested curiosity (vv. 536-7) and condescension (v. 540).

832-3 βαίην ἄφαντος πρόσθεν ἢ τοιάνδ' ἰδεῖν
κηλῖδ' ἐμαυτῷ συμφορᾶς ἀφιγμένην

The enallage comes in a prayer.

1032 ποδῶν ἂν ἄρθρα μαρτυρήσειεν τὰ σά

The messenger is very circumspect in speaking of Oedipus' origins.

1375-6 ἀλλ' ἡ τέκνων δῆτ' ὄψις ἦν ἐφίμερος
βλαστοῦσ' ὅπως ἔβλαστε, προσλεύσσειν ἐμοί;

Kühner-Gerth: "= ὄψις τ[έκνων] βλαστόντων". Kamerbeek: "βλαστοῦσ', instead of βλαστόντων is by hypallage attracted to the regimen of τέκνων" (For Kamerbeek this is an unusual admission). Oedipus speaks these lines after blinding himself: there can be no doubt that the speech expresses profound grief. But the enallage occurs within a ὑποφορά, the "supposed objection" of a speaker arguing the other side of an issue (see Jebb). A poignant effect is created by borrowing from a style inappropriate to the speaker's emotion.

1400-1 αἳ τοὐμὸν αἷμα τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν ἄπο
ἐπίετε πατρός

The enallage comes in a series of apostrophes, transfers the possessive pronominal, and occurs in a family context.

Electra

492-3 lyr. ἄλεκτρ' ἄνυμφα γὰρ ἐπέβα μιαιφόνων
γάμων ἁμιλλήμαθ' οἷσιν οὐ θέμις.

Long (p. 136) translates this highly wrought passage " 'Murderous hurrying passions for a marriage which ignores the bonds of wed-

---

[1] Cf. the many ominous references to feet, often disguised as innocent *façons de parler*, e.g. τὸ πρὸς ποσί (v. 131). This seems a much more pointed way to understand τόδε ἴχνος than Kamerbeek's interpretation provides.

lock and the nuptial couch, entered into those unlawfully'. (In translation μιαιφόνων is most easily taken with ἁμιλλήματα, and ἄλεκτρ' ἄνυμφα with γάμων)". If this is correct, Sophocles has employed an enallage and an "enallage inversa" (see p. 43) in the same expression; I know of no possible parallels to this arrangement. Further, the ordinary form of enallage is constructed with only one adjective, though there are many exceptions.[1] Sophocles has a predilection for using abstract nouns ending in -μα with unusual privative adjectives (Long, p. 52), and enallage permits him to make this combination more often.

681-2 κεῖνος γὰρ ἐλθὼν ἐς τὸ κλεινὸν Ἑλλάδος
πρόσχημ' ἀγῶνος Δελφικῶν ἄθλων χάριν

From the opening of the pedagogue's long speech. The following lines, ὅτ' ᾔσθετ' ἀνδρὸς ὀρθίων κηρυγμάτων δρόμον προσκηρυξάματος, suggest a reminiscence of official formulae.

785-6 τοὐμὸν ἐκπίνουσ' ἀεὶ
ψυχῆς ἄκρατον αἷμα

See p. 36. An enallage dealing with kindred blood and constructed with the possessive pronominal adjective.

1177 ἦ σὸν τὸ κλεινὸν εἶδος Ἠλέκτρας τόδε;

See below on *Phil.* 952.

1288-91 τὰ μὲν περισσεύοντα τῶν λόγων ἄφες,
καὶ μήτε μήτηρ ὡς κακὴ δίδασκέ με
μήθ' ὡς πατρῴαν κτῆσιν Αἴγισθος δόμων
ἀντλεῖ

Enallage falling within a reference to what another might say.

1374-5 πατρῷα προσκύσανθ' ἕδη θεῶν

Enallage in the context of worshipping.

Philoctetes

83 εἰς ἀναιδὲς ἡμέρας μέρος βραχύ

Jebb: " 'for one little roguish day': ἡμέρας μέρος βραχὺ = 'a short space (consisting in) one day' ... ἡμέρας-μέρον ('day-space') forms one notion, ἀναιδὲς has the same force as if it were ἀναιδοῦς agreeing with ἡμέρας". It is not clear to me why ἡμέρας μέρος βραχύ should not be taken rather as "a short part of one day" and ἀναιδές kept

[1] E.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 348-50.

separate from ἡμέρας.[1] If we do indeed have enallage here, Odysseus might be using a stylistic embellishment somehow to distract Neoptolemus from the shamelessness of the act being proposed.

952 ὦ σχῆμα πέτρας δίπυλον

Long (p. 103) comments: "As Jebb points out, in Euripides σχῆμα is used as a periphrasis to denote stateliness; it is applied to the palaces of Priam (*Hec.* 619) and Admetus (*Alc.* 912). This is probably the normal sense. But Philoctetes is returning to the cave in a new defenceless situation, unprotected by his bow. In these circumstances the effect of σχῆμα is both bitter and ironical, for a word appropriate to a palace is applied to a mere rock. ... Orestes is equally bitter when he asks ἦ σὸν τὸ κλεινὸν εἶδος Ἠλέκτρας τόδε; [*El.* 1177] and follows this immediately with ὦ σῶμ' ... ἐφθαρμένον (1181). What at first appear to be conventional expressions are used here with singular pathos". Enallage heightens the effect.

1123-4 lyr. καί που πολιᾶς πόντου θινὸς ἐφήμενος

This enallage is unusual in two respects: (1) the governing noun, θινός, is itself in the genitive case and (2) it occurs in a protagonist's expression of grief without being part of an apostrophe. On the other hand, apostrophes follow (v. 1128). Cf. on *OC* 533.

Oedipus Coloneus

533 lyr. ματρὸς κοινᾶς ἀπέβλαστον ὠδῖνος

Jebb: "Poetical Greek idiom would join κοινᾶς with ὠδῖνος rather than with ματρός. Cp. Aesch. *Eum.* 326-7 ματρῷον ἄγνισμα φόνου: *Ant.* 793 νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν ξύναιμον. κοινᾶς = which bore me also". If this is right, we have an "optional enallage" which an alert listener might detect. The adjective is not precisely ἀπὸ κοινοῦ since logic gives the adjective more to ματρός than to ὠδῖνος. The prevalence of enallage in family contexts supports Jebb's assertion.

Assuming this is enallage, it shares the two unusual features exhibited by *Phil.* 1123-4. Here too, apostrophe is not far off: the Chorus has interrupted the sentence Oedipus had started at v. 523 with the words ὦ Ζεῦ.

1687-8 lyr. βίου δύσοιστον ... τροφάν

---

[1] I am not persuaded by T. B. L. Webster's proposal (*Sophocles' Philoctetes* [Cambridge, 1970]) to take εἰς ἀναιδές adverbially.

This too is irregular in the same respects as the last two enallages. (Except that Antigone is, formally speaking, the tritagonist; yet with Oedipus gone she becomes the central character.) Here there are no mitigating apostrophes.

Enallage in Euripides

R. Lattimore's chronological order is observed (*The Complete Greek Tragedies*, eds. D. Grene and R. Lattimore [Chicago, 1958], Vol. IV, pp. 612 ff.).

Alcestis

103-4 lyr. οὐ νεολαία δουπεῖ χεὶρ γυναικῶν

Dale entertains the possibility, if the passage is not corrupt, that the feminine form of the abstract noun νεολαία suggested "its use as a poetic variant of νέα". Williger (pp. 15 f.) thinks it improbable that Euripides could have given an adjectival force to a word with the suffix -ια. To me it seems appropriate to place such an innovation (which the audience would probably take as an archaism) in special prominence by using it in an enallage.

538 ξένων πρὸς ἄλλην ἑστίαν πορεύσομαι

ἄλλων V B ἄλλην L P

In a limited way Dale is right to say "Either ἄλλων or ἄλλην gives the same sense". The nuance, however, would be quite different. Throughout the stichomythia which begins at v. 509 Heracles' language is more formal than Admetus', more given to generalization (v. 528), euphemistic formula (v. 514), and proverb (v. 542). The dramatic situation dictates that Admetus be more agitated and that a majority of his lines be *ad hoc*, specific replies.[1] Thus it is appropriate that when at v. 545 Admetus rephrases Heracles' declaration his language is closer to the prosaic:

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλου σ' ἀνδρὸς ἑστίαν μολεῖν.

This contrast would be lost if we read ἄλλων.

569 ὦ πολύξεινος καὶ ἐλεύθερος ἀνδρὸς . . . οἶκος

πολυξείνου καὶ ἐλευθέρου Purgold

A logical enallage. The MSS. reading is surely to be preferred.

[1] Dale's comment (ad 544), "all through this exchange we catch echoes of the polite courtesies of everyday Athenian social life", is applicable mainly to Heracles' side of the conversation.

Medea

211-12 lyr. δι' ἅλα νύχιον ἐφ' ἁλμύραν
Πόντου κλῇδ' ἀπέραντον

ἀπεράντου Milton

Enallage would eliminate the difficulty in calling the κλεὶς "infinite". See Page, who discusses the problem at length but does not consider the possibility of enallage.

Hippolytus

335 δώσω· σέβας γὰρ χειρὸς αἰδοῦμαι τὸ σόν.

The line is spoken by Phaedra to the Nurse who is supplicating her.

395-6 θυραῖα φρονήματα ἀνδρῶν

Wilamowitz (ad *HF* 468) translates: "die Gesinnung fremder Leute". Perhaps the tongue, which Phaedra regards as an organ equipped with its own will, is being quoted; as a chastiser the tongue might employ a very formal sort of diction.

761-2 lyr. πλέκτας πεισμάτων ἀρχὰς

The whole rope is twisted, not just its ends: cf. *Od.* 10.168.

1140-1 lyr. νυμφιδία δ' ἀπόλωλε φυγᾷ σᾷ
λέκτρων ἅμιλλα κούραις.

Cf. νυμφιδίους εὐνάς (Eur. *Alc.* 855-6), νυμφεῖα λέχη (Simon. 124B), νυμφεῖα εὐνά (Pind. *Nem.* 5.30), and νύμφια λέκτρα (Callim. fr. 63.11 Pf.). The association of any adjective meaning "bridal" with words for bed is so strong that νυμφιδία must have been felt with λέκτρων. Barrett's translation, "By your exile the girls have lost their bridal rivalry for your bed", is, therefore, incomplete. (The MSS. error, νυμφίδια λέχη, might have originated in a copyist's conviction that a word for "bed", with which νυμφίδια accented as a neuter was in agreement, belonged in the text).

Andromache

159 δεινὴ γὰρ ἠπειρῶτις εἰς τὰ τοίαδε
ψυχὴ γυναικῶν.

Bruhn (II). Perhaps Hermione is putting the grandeur of enallage to sarcastic use.

584 οὑμὸς δέ γ' αὐτὴν ἔλαβε παῖς παιδὸς γέρας

Peleus' words have a legal ring. Cf. on 1063 below.

1003 πατρὸς φόνιον δίκην

Wilamowitz translates: "Busse für den Mord des Vaters". Orestes is here reporting Neoptolemus' request to Apollo.

1063 σῷ γε παιδὸς παιδὶ πορσύνων μόρον

σῷ Lobeck σοῦ codd.

Spoken to Peleus. That the order of the two nouns in the enallage is reversed (compared to v. 584) suggests that παῖς παιδός is not a commonly used pair functioning as a compound.

Cyclops

58-9 lyr. ποθοῦσί σ' ἁμερόκοιτοι
βλαχαὶ σμικρῶν τεκέων.

A parody, I think, of an enallage Aeschylus had used at *Sept.* 348 to describe the sacking of a city.

Heracles Furens

288-9 σὲ μὲν δόκησις ἔλαβεν εὐκλεὴς δορός,
ὥστ' οὐκ ἀνεκτὸν δειλίας θανεῖν σ' ὕπο·

Wilamowitz translates the enallage "der Ruf berühmter Kriegstat". We may compare Pind. *Ol.* 12.13-5 τεὰ τιμὰ ποδῶν. For rhetorical purposes Megara reminds Amphitryon of his glorious victory over the Taphians by using an element of the grand style. That an enallage is appropriate is a type of implicit proof that he is the sort of man to whom a cowardly death should seem intolerable.

468 τἀμὰ πεδία γῆς

The enallage comes in Megara's listing of the legal disposition of Heracles' lands.

Troades

564-5 lyr. καράτομος ἐρημία νεανίδων

Kühner-Gerth: "wört[lich]: die vom Haupte abgeschnittene Oede der Jünglinge, d.i. Todesöde". A particularly impressive example. Here the effect is pathetic, but when Athena uses a very similar expression in the *Rhesus* (vv. 605-6), it sounds malicious: τὰς δ' Ἕκτορος / ... ἔασον ... καρατόμους σφαγάς.[1]

1220 Φρύγια πέπλων ἀγάλματ' ἐξάπτω χροός

[1] I see no way that these two phrases can be used in arguing for or against the authenticity of the *Rhesus*.

With this Lobeck compares σκυλευμάτων Φρυγίων ... κόσμον (1207-8) to show ... *ubi licuit epitheton transferre, non semper translatum esse.* No such demonstration is necessary since it is nonsense to speak of an enallage in the case of an epithet which is *always* transferred.

As he had done in the *Alcestis* (see above on v. 538), Euripides gives one character an enallage and another its prosaic equivalent within the scene. The chorus is relatively matter of fact:

καὶ μὴν πρόχειρον αἵδε σοι σκυλευμάτων
Φρυγίων φέρουσι κόσμον ἐξάπτειν νεκρῷ.

Hecabe, imaging the robes as trappings at Astyanax' wedding to a noble Asian woman, substitutes an enallage, thereby suggesting the ceremonial speech appropriate to such an occasion.[1] Grammatically, *licuit epitheton transferre* when the Chorus expressed the same thought, but I think an enallage would have sounded excessively portentous and prevented an effective juxtaposition of two types of diction. (Admittedly the Chorus' words fall within one of Kastner's "Wortfelder", but the influence of context on diction was, of course, not so unsubtle as to deny the poet a choice).

Ion

281 πατέρα δ' ἀληθῶς χάσμα σὸν κρύπτει χθονός;

Matthiä: "statt χάσμα σῆς χθ[ονός]. The word order is against the translation "your father". σὸν χθονός refers to Athens: cf. v. 238. If χθονός is partitive (cf. pp. 10 ff.) it would still go with σόν, but then we would have a quasi-enallage, since the genitive would not be dependent.

Phoenissae

100 κέδρου παλαιὰν κλίμακα

Wilamowitz (ad *HF* 468) saw enallage; he translates: " 'die Treppe aus altem (duftigem) Zedernholz', nicht 'die alte Treppe' ". It is more natural to take κέδρου as a genitive of material.

1351 lyr. λευκοπήχεις κτύπους χεροῖν

Bruhn (II). Williger (p. 23) argues that there can be no question of a *compositum abundans* and that Euripides could not have intended to say "weissarmige Hände". Perhaps this would be true

[1] Also, χρόος is more poignant than νεκρῷ.

if Euripides had written in German, but in Greek there is considerable latitude in the denotations of words for arm and hand (see LSJ s.v. πῆχυς and χείρ), so enallage is quite possible.

1635 σὺ δ' ἐκλιποῦσα τριπτύχους θρήνους νεκρῶν

τριπτύχων νεκρῶν γόους γρ. M γρ. B θρήνους] τύπους

Creon, in an imperious tone, to Antigone immediately after his proclamation (at v. 1631) to the Thebans.

Orestes

225 ὦ βοστρύχων πινῶδες ἄθλιον κάρα

Kühner-Gerth: "verwildertes Lockenhaupt". Electra is speaking emotionally, but the enallage is within an apostrophe.

988 lyr. ποτανὸν ... δίωγμα πώλων

Matthiä: "statt τοὺς πτανοὺς ἵππους διωκομένους". Part of Electra's escape prayer.

Bacchae

866-7 lyr. ὡς νέβρος χλοεραῖς ἐμπαί-
ζουσα λείμακος ἡδοναῖς

Dodds comments that " 'Green joy', a colour-word applied to an abstract noun, is bold for a Greek poet, though not so bold as Marvell's 'Annihilating all that's made To a green thought in a green shade' ". Because enallage was an accepted device in tragic diction, the enallage here, though more audacious than most, is not astonishing.[1]

Iphigenia Aulidensis

1266 παῦσαί τε λέκτρων ἁρπαγὰς Ἑλληνίκων

Ἑλληνικῶν Elmsley ἑλληνικάς L P

ἁρπαγή can be used with a technical legal sense—cf. Fraenkel ad *Ag.* 534. Perhaps Agamemnon is recalling the words of the oath.

[1] Cf. E. D. Francis, " 'Chiron's Laughter' ", *CP*, 67 (1972), p. 289.

APPENDIXES

A. "Enallage", "Hypallage", and "Transferred Epithet"

When modern scholars use the term "enallage" they frequently enclose it in quotation marks or add "so-called" before it. They do so either because the word is relatively unfamiliar or because they deny that there is any transfer. Sometimes they employ a fuller expression, "enallage *attributi*", or "enallage *adjectivi*". On occasion "hypallage" is written to denote the same phenomenon (mostly by English and American scholars who wrote or were educated in the last century). "Enallage" is the less confusing word because "hypallage" sometimes refers to metonomy—this is Cicero's usage at *Orat.* 27.93. "Transferred epithet" denotes a phenomenon semantically closer to enallage than metonomy, but it does not specify the inflectional categories involved.

"Enallage" is not perfectly unambiguous either. The ancient grammarians used ἐναλλαγή in a more general sense and their practice has been followed by Renaissance rhetoricians and even some modern scholars. In *The Arte of English Poesie,* for example, George Puttenham remarks of enallage: "Your figures that worke *auricularly* by exchange, were more observable to the Greeks and Latines ... for the multiplicitie of their Grammaticall accidents, ... that is to say their divers cases, moodes, tenses, genders, with variable terminations, by reason whereof, they changed not the very word, but kept the word, and changed the shape of him onely, using one case for another, or tense, or person, or gender, or number, or moode. We, having no such varietie of accidents, have little or no use of this figure. They called it *Enallage*".[1]

Apollonius Dyscolus speaks of ἐναλλαγὴ πτώσεως (*Pron.* 54. 13). As Williger observes (p. 10, n. 4), the modern meaning of the term, i.e. the one used in this study, is superficially similar in that the adjective in an enallage appears in a case other than the one

---

[1] Quoted from Sister Miriam Joseph, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (New York, 1947), p. 62. Puttenham is quite right in maintaining that "exchanges" are more readily noticed in an inflected language.

expected. (Williger attributes the modern usageto Matthiä, but cf. Matthiä ad Eur. *Phoen.* 30 [Leipzig, 1821].)[1]

B. πόντος AND ἁλός

Miss Gray (*loc. cit.*, p. 21): "It is ἁλός when the sea breaks on the headlands and when ships are launched or drawn up on to the beach. Sea creatures usually come up ἐξ ἁλός but they can also rise ἐκ πόντοιο. ἁλός is regularly used to fix the geographical position of the land which it surrounds, but an island can lie far out πολυκλύστῳ ἐνὶ πόντῳ as well as be ἁλὶ κεκλιμένη". Page (*op. cit.*, [p. 13], p. 229) contends that "The composer of ἁλὸς πολυβένθεος, βαθείης ἐξ ἁλός, εἰς ἅλα . . . βαθεῖαν, was merely serving the convenience of the moment by transferring traditional epithets from other objects to 'the sea' ". And further (*ibid.*, p. 268, n. 28): "The attachment of βαθείης (-αν) to ἁλός (ἅλα) would never have been made in the early Epic: it may be by chance that βαθύς is never applied to πόντος; it is not by chance that it has no formular attachment to ἅλα, *the sea around the coast*". Since the traditional view of πόντος is erroneous, or at least incomplete, in the light of comparative evidence, one should not accept the other half of the supposed opposition without further investigation.

C. τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου (2 Ep. Thess. 17)

Taken in its context, Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὅ ἐστιν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ· οὕτως γράφω suggests the translation "Paul's (signature) salutation, set down by my own hand, a mark of recognition (and, therefore, of authenticity) to be found in each letter". Earlier in the same letter Paul warns against being frightened by a forged letter, δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν. The standard grammatical explanation ignores the situation.

D. Two-word Expressions and Kastner "Wortfelder"

The two-word expression seems to show the same sensitivity to context as enallage. A comparison of the "Wortfelder" (see pp.

[1] Since I reject Williger's contention that enallage is merely the assimilation of case endings and believe, instead, that there is a real transfer of the adjective, I cannot accept his objection (in the same footnote) to Kühner-Gerth's classification of enallage as "eine 'Vertauschung' der attributiven Formen".

28 ff.) with Kühner-Gerth's examples of "Das Adjectiv statt des Genetivs" (pp. 261 ff.) shows that all but eight of the non-Homeric citations probably or certainly fall into one of the semantic groups. "*" indicates that a word cited by Kastner occurs in the expression, "?" that membership in the "Wortfeld" is questionable.

1a

Soph. *Aj.* 884 Ὀλυμπιάδες θεαὶ ἢ ποταμῶν

1c

Soph. *OT* 184 ἀκτὰν παρὰ βώμιον

1e

*Soph. *Ant.* 1019 θυστάδας λιτάς

2

Aesch. *Pers.* 8 νόστῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ

3

Il. 2.20 Νηλῄῳ υἷι

Il. 4.367 Καπανήιος υἱός

Il. 13.67 Αἴαντα Τελαμώνιον υἱόν

Il. 14.317 Ἰξιονίης ἀλόχοιο

Od. 3.190 Φιλοκτήτην, Ποιάντιον ἀγλαὸν υἱόν

Od. 15.397 ἅμ' ὕεσσιν ἀνακτορίῃσιν

Pind. *Pyth.* 8.19 Ξενάρκειον υἱόν

Soph. *Aj.* 134 Τελαμώνιε παῖ

*Soph. *Ant.* 826 πετραία βλάστα

Soph. *OC* 407 ἐμφύλιον αἷμα

Soph. *OT* 267 τῷ Λαβδακείῳ παιδὶ Πολυδώρου τε

Eur. *Med.* 404 τοῖς Σισυφείοις τοῖς τ' Ἰάσονος γάμοις

Eur. *Supp.* 148 αἷμα συγγενές

Theoc. *Id.* 15.110 ἁ Βερενικεία θυγάτηρ

Theoc. *Id.* 26.36 ἀδελφεαὶ αὐτᾶς Καδμεῖαι

Hdt. 7.106 τοῖσι Μασκαμείοισι

Pl. *Gorg.* 482a ὁ Κλεινίειος οὗτος

4

*Aesch. *Ag.* 10 ἁλώσιμόν τε βάξιν

Aesch. *Ag.* 262 εὐαγγέλοισιν ἐλπίσιν

6

*Eur. *El.* 126 ἄναγε πολύδακρυν ἀδονάν

8

*Hdt. 7.190 ἄχαρις συμφορὴ παιδοφόνος

9

Pind. *Ol.* 2.43 νέοις ἐν ἀέθλοις

Pind. *Ol.* 3.37 (ἀγῶνα περὶ) ῥιμφαρμάτου διφρηλασίας

?Aesch. *Supp.* 44 ταύρειος φόνος

Soph. *Aj.* 55 πολύκερως φόνος

Soph. *Aj.* 935 ἀριστόχειρ ἀγών

?Soph. *Ant.* 1022 ἀνδρόφθορον αἷμα

Soph. *El.* 699 ὠκύπους ἀγών

*Soph. *El.* 861 χαλάργοις ἐν ἁμίλλαις

Eur. *HF* 1273 τετρασκελὴς κενταυροπληθὴς πόλεμος

*Eur. *Ion* 987 γηγενῆ μάχην

?Eur. *IT* 72 Ἕλλην φόνος

?Eur. *Or.* 883 αἷμα μητροκτόνον

E. Enallage in Prose

Williger's reckless statement (p. 10, n. 3), "Die Enallage ist auch der griechischen Prosa keineswegs fremd, wie Wilamowitz und Lobeck gezeigt haben", is easily refuted. In the first place, Lobeck and Wilamowitz cite very few examples in prose. (Wilamowitz gives only one. Evidently, Williger took Wilamowitz's general dictum, "in Wahrheit kann eine flektierende Sprache kaum anders verfahren", in lieu of actual examples). Further, the majority of the alleged instances are highly dubious.

Periphrastic constructions have already been discussed (pp. 19 f.). Bernhardy (p. 247) cites Xen. *An.* 4.7.22 γέρρα δασεῖων ὠμοβόεια. This can be supported by *An.* 4.7.26 δερμάτων ὠμοβοείων (if the two-word phrase matters at all), but the contrary evidence, Hdt. 7.76 ἀσπίδας ὠμοβοίνας and Xenophon's own σάλπιγξιν ὠμοβοίναις

at least countervails. Wilamowitz gives Thuc. 1.8.1 σκευῇ τῶν ὅπλων ξυντεθαμμένῃ. He translates: "an der Art (der Mode, dem Stil vgl. 6 αὕτη ἡ σκευὴ κατέσχεν) der Waffen, die mitbegraben waren", but this is a credible example only if we accept his interpretation of σκευή; a glance at his claimed parallel shows that the word can be perfectly well understood in its concrete sense even there. Further, LSJ gives no abstract example of σκευή other than "fashion, style *of dress or equipment*" (emphasis added), so it seems highly probable that σκευῇ ξυντεθαμμένῃ was intelligible by itself and quite ordinary, τῶν ὅπλων being added because σκευή had been recently used of clothing. If the expression is in fact an enallage, it would fall into a rather large group of examples involving death, lamentation, and burial (see p. 29).

Thuc. 2.61.2 ἐν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἀσθενεῖ τῆς γνώμης (cited by Lobeck, Kühner-Gerth, and Schwyzer) is formed with the possessive pronominal. For its membership in a Kastner "Wortfeld" see p. 31. Also, the context mitigates the strangeness to some degree: the chapter is full of abstraction and personification.

Plut. *Mor.* 106B 21-22 ἐνταῦθα ἄν τις ἑλκύσειε τὴν τοῦ Σωκράτους φωνὴν τὴν οἰομένην, which Lobeck thought was an enallage, probably is not: the voice is disembodied from Socrates and can itself opine and advise. If enallage, it belongs to Kastner "Wortfeld" 4 (see p. 31).

Otherwise, the only certain enallages I know of in prose are Appian *B.C.* 4.89 ἥδοντο εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τῇ ὄψει τοῦ πλήθους ἰσχυροτάτῃ σφίσι φανείσῃ (Bruhn [T]; cf. p. 44) and Ath. 9.379C ἄνδρες δικασταί (δικαστὰς γὰρ ὑμᾶς οὐκ ὀκνήσαιμ' ἂν καλεῖν ἀναμένων τὴν ὑμετέραν τῶν αἰσθητηρίων κρίσιν), which is obviously grandiloquent and belongs to a Kastner "Wortfeld".

Thus enallage is very much alien to Greek prose: there are practically no legitimate examples, and of the few that exist most fall within the same contexts as the enallages of Greek poetry.[1]

F. Latin Enallage

In principle, Latin could have developed enallage from the materials of its own syntax since, like Greek, it had both the genitive

[1] Note also that enallage does not appear in either J. Riddell, "Digest of Platonic Idioms" (in his edition of the *Apology* [Oxford, 1867]), or in the index of rhetorical terms in C. Rehdantz, *Demosthenes Neun Philippische Reden* (4th ed., rev. F. Blass; Leipzig, 1886), 1 2.2.

and the possessive adjective in contemporaneous use. Indeed Wackernagel's "Genitiv und Adjectiv" (see p. 21) is largely about Latin. The evidence, however, suggests that enallage is strictly a borrowing from Greek.

There are, according to E. Norden [1] and Kühner-Stegmann-Thierfelder,[2] no attestations prior to Lucretius (1.475 *Alexandri Phrygio sub pectore*) and Varro (*Rust.* 3.3.10 *pelagii greges piscium*). Norden also mentions Catullus 51.11 *gemina teguntur lumina nocte*, but this is not precisely an enallage.

Norden considered it possible that enallage entered Latin *via* translations of Greek tragedy. That there are in fact no translations of enallage preserved may be purely accidental; but it may also be a sign that the device would not be recognizable from Latin hieratic language and so would utterly baffle a Greekless audience. Further, my incomplete examination of Latin enallage, primarily in Virgil and Horace, does not show the same concentration in linguistically conservative contexts as the Greek usage. Nor do we find enallage with the possessive pronominal, the form I have argued is the oldest and most productive in Greek.

Perhaps the most striking difference between Greek and Latin enallage is the far greater frequency of examples in Latin prose than Greek prose. This suggests that for the Romans enallage was more a device grounded in the conventions of literature than a borrowing from the language of prayer and proclamations. It is not surprising that writers who are, by and large, in the Hellenistic tradition of Greek literature radically transform a figure which flourished in the fifth century.

A more thorough study of Latin enallage is planned for the future.

---

[1] *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (4th ed.; Stuttgart, 1957), p. 112.

[2] *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (4th ed.; Munich, 1962), II, pp. 220 f.

INDEX LOCORUM

Aeschylus
Agamemnon
10: 73
47-54: 38, n. 1
50: 32, 49, 53
50-4: 40
53-4: 49
53-5: 54
55: 46, n. 1
153: 55
228: 38
262: 41, 73
312-3: 30, 55
418-9: 4
503: 33, 55
504: 3, 5, n. 1, 6, 48, 49-50, 56
507: 11, n. 1
513: 53
534: 69
743-4: 56
1509: 34
1509-10: 8, 36
1535: 9
1627: 57
Choephori
30-1: 29, 56
1070: 32, 49, 57
Eumenides
212: 2
292: 5, 10, 33, 57
326-7: 29, 38, 64
457: 33, 57
Persae
8: 57, 72
58: 30, 50
81-2: 50
247: 49, 51
250: 5, 33
404: 37
412: 9
428: 18
488: 12, n. 1
751-2: 51
Prometheus Vinctus
88-91: 57
89-90: 34, 34, n. 1, 58
91: 18
112: 26, 31, 58
855-6: 39, 58
879-80: 9
1076: 9
Septem
64: 8, 34
83: 11-12
171-2: 30, 51, 52
304-5: 11, 33
348-50: 31, 40, 52, 63, n. 1, 67
639: 39
639-40: 38
681: 36, n. 2
724-5: 30, 52
1007-8: 11
1008: 29, 35, 52
1076-7: 34, 49
Supplices
44: 73
189: 53
222: 53, n. 3
236-7: 50, 51
242: 53
260: 12, n. 1
320: 50, 52
480: 53
482: 30, 52, 53
501: 53
517: 53
520-1: 53
1041-2: 52, 53
Fragmenta (ed. Nauck)
150: 12
158.3-4: 31, 33
Alcman (ed. Lobel-Page)
89.5: 13
Alexis (ed. Kock)
89: 18
Anaxandrides
33.16: 44
41.37: 44
Anthologia Palatina
6.233.6: 45
7.334.3: 6, 23, 29, 45
7.496: 10, 43
Antiphanes (ed. Kock)
217.20-1: 44
217.21: 44

Antiphon
196.3: 13
Apollonius Dyscolus
de Pronominibus
54.13: 70
Apollonius Rhodius
1.1023-4: 44
4.1519: 44
4.1780: 33, 44
Appian
Bella Civilia
4.89: 40, 44, 74
Aristophanes
Acharnenses
93: 22
Aves
145: 14
250: 10, 13, 34, 44
1198: 31, 44
Lysistrata
261: 44
Pax
155: 44
Plutus
45-6: 30, 44
Ranae
1317-8: 14
Vespae
838: 44
Athenaeus
9.379C: 23, 31, 74
Callimachus (ed. Pfeiffer)
fr. 63.11: 66
112.9: 45
Catullus
51.11: 75
Cicero
Orator
27.93: 70
Cratinus (ed. Kock)
220: 10, 33, 44
Dio Cassius (ed. Boissevain)
fr. 49.4: 20
Dionysius Periegeta (D.P.)
37: 12, 34
Euripides
Alcestis
23: 33, 50
103-4: 29, 65
261: 1, 50
509: 65
514: 65
528: 65
538: 30, 65, 68
542: 65
544: 65, n. 1
545: 65
569: 65
855: 35
855-6: 66
912: 64
Andromache
159: 50, 66
348: 35
584: 23, 41, 66, 67
1003: 29, 31, 38, 67
1063: 23, 29, 41, 66, 67
Bacchae
556-9: 57
866-7: 32, 54, 69
1134: 61
1327-8: 6, 23, 31, 41
Cyclops
58-9: 31, 40, 67
Electra
1: 11, 33
126: 73
435-7: 14
450: 40
Hecuba
619: 64
Helen
400: 8, 12, 13, 34
Hercules Furens
288-9: 50, 67
410-11: 12, 13, 34
450: 8, n. 1, 34
468: 8, n. 1, 11, 23, 33, 38, 66, 67, 68
532: 46
543: 50
876: 23, 33
883-4: 31
1273: 73
Hippolytus
335: 23, 66
395-6: 50, 66
761-2: 66
1140-1: 32, 35, 39, 66
1391: 34
Ion
238: 68
281: 23, 29, 33, 41, 68
987: 41, 73
1262-3: 50
1337: 5, 23

1486-7: 5, n. 1, 6, 56
Iphigenia Aulidensis
394: 23, 49
784: 23, 41
1266: 32, 39, 69
Iphigenia Taurica
72: 73
110: 18
Medea
211-2: 34, 66
404: 72
Orestes
225: 69
479-80: 50
883: 73
988: 69
Phoenissae
30: 40, 71
30-1: 23
100: 50, 68
543: 18
1351: 29, 68
1631: 69
1635: 29, 50, 69
Rhesus
605-6: 67
Supplices
148: 72
631: 23, 33
Troades
1-2: 12, 13, 34
564-5: 29, 67
1207-8: 68
1220: 50, 67
Herodas
3.75: 10
Herodotus
1.1: 14
1.6.2: 13
1.172: 39
1.202: 14
2.33.4: 13
2.97: 13
7.76: 73
7.106: 72
7.106.1: 11
7.190: 73
Hesiod
Opera
414: 16
Scutum
7: 50
24: 46
Theogonia
40: 34, n. 1
319: 40, n. 1, 43
335: 43
426: 16
Fragmenta (ed. Merkelbach-West)
33a.20: 32, 43
Homer
Iliad
1.3-4: 43
2.20: 72
2.54: 1, 21, 27
2.209: 13
2.816: 16
3.180: 22
4.313: 25
4.367: 72
5.741: 27
6.528: 41
7.479: 42
10.56: 16
11.26: 50
11.403: 25
12.330: 15
13.67: 72
14.16: 16
14.317: 72
17.226: 22
17.371-2: 16
18.8: 25
18.53: 25
18.317: 43
19.302: 26
21.59: 13
21.195: 16
22.93-5: 50
23.260: 16
23.611: 25
23.720: 16
23.827: 16
24.681: 16
Odyssey
1.9: 41
1.29: 43
1.52-3: 13
2.138: 25
3.190: 72
5.54: 58
5.261: 26
8.149: 25
8.232: 58
9.12: 24, 25
10.168: 66

10.521: 16
11.11: 43
11.90-1: 6
11.369: 26
11.376: 24
12.70: 47
14.185: 26
14.197: 23, 26, 32, 43
15.397: 72
24.81: 16
Homeric Hymns
Apollo
271: 16
374: 16
Ceres
13-4: 58
14: 58
14-5: 43
15: 12, 34
Horace
Carmina
1.32: 27, n. 1
Satirae
2.6.17: 45
Inscriptions
BMus. Inscr. 1012.5: 12, 34
IG 12(2).169: 6
Ion Tragicus (ed. Nauck)
60: 12, 13, 34
Lucretius
1.475: 75
Lycophron
831-2: 29, 45
Lyrica Adespota (ed. Page)
939.19: 12
Mellino apud Stobaeum (ed. Hense-Wachsmuth)
12.11: 23, 45
12.11-2: 33, 34
Mimnermus (ed. Diehl)
13.6: 17
New Testament
2 *Epistula ad Thessalonicenses*
17: 22, 71
Nonnus
Dionysiaca
10.139: 10
14.270: 10
25.385: 27
30.209: 10, 11
43.225: 12, 34
43.311: 33
44.1: 10, 33
48.241: 10, 33
Ovid
Metamorphoses
8.229-30: 38, n. 2
Pindar
Isthmia
7.19: 34, 35, 47
8.3: 33, 46
Nemea
3.59: 34, 46, 48
5.30: 66
6.15-6: 37
6.44: 33, 48
7.73: 48
7.93-4: 30
8.2: 22
10.17: 39
Olympia
1.42: 33, 46, 48
1.48: 34, 46, 48
1.66: 39
1.82-3: 1
2.43: 73
3.3: 45
3.37: 73
6.57: 52
6.85: 46
8.42: 23, 48
8.68: 48
8.75: 47
10.5-6: 47
10.9-12: 47
10.24-5: 30, 48
10.86ff.: 47
12.13: 47
12.13-5: 67
12.13-7: 23, 41, 47
Pythia
2.73-4: 47
4.15: 33, 39, 47
4.144: 18
4.149: 14, 47, 48
4.194-5: 47
4.196: 35
4.205: 48
4.255: 23, 47, 48
6.5: 45
8.19: 72
8.37: 32
8.55: 46
9.83: 33, 46, 48
10.20-1: 1, 45
10.36: 45, 48

Fragmenta (ed. Bowra)
197: 47
220.2: 14
Plato
Gorgias
482a: 72
Laches
179a: 22
Leges
790b: 20
Plautus
Asinaria
624: 22
736: 22
Trinummus
388: 22
Plutarch
Moralia
106B21-2: 74
Polybius
4.64: 20
Quintus Smyrnaeus
2.651: 10
Simonides (ed. Bergk)
111.43 (= *Anth. Pal.* 7.496): 34, 43
124: 66
Sophocles
Ajax
7-8: 34, 59
55: 73
134: 72
176: 59
249: 8, 34, 59
263ff.: 59
860: 30, 37, 59
884: 72
892: 31, 59
935: 73
Antigone
1: 17, n. 4
26: 29, 50, 60
35-6: 2, n. 3, 60
658-9: 37
793-4: 1, 6, 32, 36, 45, 64
826: 72
862-3: 32, 37
862-4: 39
862-5: 60
879-80: 18, 30
937: 11
980: 39
1019: 72
1022: 41, 73
1164: 37
Electra
492-3: 32, 39, 60, 62
681-2: 32, 63
699: 73
784-6: 36
785-6: 23, 63
861: 73
1177: 18, 50, 63, 64
1178: 18
1181: 18, 64
1289-91: 63
1374-5: 5, 30, 37, 63
1390: 5, 23
Oedipus Coloneus
41: 52
297: 10, 33, 37
344: 22
407: 72
523: 64
533: 59, 64
704: 18
1687-8: 59, 64
Oedipus Tyrannus
99: 9
108-9: 61
131: 62, n. 1
161: 31
184: 72
267: 72
296: 39
532-3: 9, 50, 62
536-7: 62
540: 62
832-3: 9, 29, 31, 62
869: 18, 31, 35
869-70: 40
1032: 5, 6, 23, 31, 62
1229-30: 2
1235: 17, n. 4
1375-6: 8, n. 1, 40, 44, 62
1400-1: 23, 36, 62
Philoctetes
83: 50, 63
952: 5, 33, 63, 64
1123-4: 7, n. 1, 35, 59, 64
1128: 64
Trachiniae
357: 2, n. 3, 60
507-9: 19
527: 19, 32, 39
656: 34, 60

666-7: 60
669-70: 50, 60
755: 22
815-8: 61
817-8: 37
964: 59, 61
993: 30, 49, 61
Fragmenta (ed. Pearson)
538: 30
799.3: 37
841: 50, 56
941.9: 15
Theocritus
15.110: 72
17.126: 30, 45
26.36: 72
Thucydides
1.8.1: 29, 74
1.110.1: 19
2.61.2: 23, 31, 74
2.97.1: 13
4.83: 19
4.109.2: 13
6.27: 48
6.60: 19
7.6: 48
7.64: 38
Tragica Adespota (ed. Nauck)
110.1-2: 32
Varro
De Re Rustica
3.3.10: 75
Xenophon
Anabasis
4.7.22: 73
4.7.26: 73
7.3.32: 73
Cynegeticus
4.3: 59
Zosimus
5.25: 19